

## **IV - GENERAL ASSEMBLY - IMPORTANT VOTES AND CONSENSUS ACTIONS**

Public Law 101-246 calls for analysis and discussion of “votes on issues which directly affected United States interests and on which the United States lobbied extensively.” An important basis for identifying issues is their consistency with the State Department’s Strategic Goals. For the 62<sup>nd</sup> UN General Assembly (UNGA) in 2007, 13 votes and 11 consensus resolutions were identified for inclusion in this section.

Section IV contains five parts: (1) a listing and description of the 13 important votes at the 62<sup>nd</sup> UNGA; (2) a listing and description of the 11 important consensus resolutions at the 62<sup>nd</sup> UNGA; (3) voting coincidence percentages with the United States on these important actions that were adopted by votes, arranged both alphabetically by country and in rank order of agreed votes; (4) voting coincidence percentages by UN regional groups and other important groups; and (5) a comparison of voting coincidence percentages on important votes with those on overall votes from Section III. An additional column in the tables of important votes (parts three and four above) presents the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including the 11 important consensus resolutions as additional identical votes. Since not all states are equally active at the United Nations, these coincidence percentages were refined to reflect a country’s rate of participation in all UN voting overall. The participation rate was calculated by dividing the number of Yes-No-Abstain votes cast by a UN member in Plenary (i.e., the number of times it was not absent) by the total number of Plenary votes (93).

### **IMPORTANT VOTES**

The following 13 important votes are identified by a short title, document number, date of vote, and results (Yes-No-Abstain), with the U.S. vote noted. For each vote, a summary of the resolution or decision is provided (“General Assembly” is the subject of the verbs in the first paragraph), followed by background on the resolution and an explanation of the U.S. position. The resolutions/decisions are listed in order by the date adopted.

#### **1. U.S. Embargo of Cuba**

**A/Res/62/3**

October 30

184-4(US)-1

Calls upon all states to refrain from promulgating and applying laws and measures such as the “Helms-Burton Act,” whose extra-territorial consequences allegedly affect the sovereignty of other states and the legitimate interests of entities or persons under their jurisdictions and the freedom of trade and navigation. Urges states to repeal such laws.

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

*Background:* In 1960, the United States imposed a trade and financial transaction embargo on Cuba because of Castro's repressive policies and expropriation of U.S. property without compensation. The United States strengthened the embargo in 1962, 1992, and 1996. The General Assembly has adopted a resolution condemning this embargo since 1992.

No country introduced any amendments to the resolution (in 2006, Australia introduced an amendment, which Cuba defeated with a no-action motion, noting that the laws mentioned in the resolution were motivated by valid concerns about the continued lack of democracy and political freedom in Cuba). This year, Australia limited its explanation of vote to deploring the extraterritorial elements of the embargo while noting that its vote "should not be interpreted as in any way endorsing the internal policies of Cuba."

*U.S. Position:* The United States again voted against this resolution, emphasizing that the trade embargo is a bilateral issue that is not an appropriate subject for UN consideration. This resolution constituted an attempt by Cuba to divert attention from its government's failings, inaccurately blaming the United States for the hardships of the Cuban people. The measures imposed by the United States do not constitute a blockade, as the embargo does not affect Cuba's trade with other nations. Cuba remains free to trade with any other country in the world, and indeed does so. Moreover, U.S. law permits the sale of food and medicine, and the United States itself is the largest supplier of food to Cuba. Israel, the Marshall Islands, and Palau also voted no; Micronesia abstained.

## 2. Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People

**A/Res/62/80**

December 10

109-8(US)-55

Requests the Committee to continue to exert all efforts to promote the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, to support the Middle East peace process, and to mobilize international support for and assistance to the Palestinian people. Authorizes the Committee to make such adjustments in its approved program of work as it may consider appropriate and necessary in the light of developments and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its 63<sup>rd</sup> session and thereafter.

*Background:* In 1975, the General Assembly established the Committee by Resolution 3376 and renews its support of the Committee annually.

*U.S. Position:* The United States believes that the continuation of this Committee, which embodies international discrimination against Israel, is inconsistent with UN support for the efforts of the Quartet (United States, the United Nations, the European Union, and Russia) to achieve a just and durable

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

solution of democratic Israeli and Palestinian states living in peace. The activities of this Committee continue to promulgate actively a one-sided view of Israeli-Palestinian issues and do not contribute constructively to efforts to resolve the conflict. The United States believes this Committee should be abolished and actively lobbies other countries to withdraw their support for the annual resolution renewing the Committee's mandate.

3. Division for Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat

**A/Res/62/81**

December 10

110-8(US)-54

Requests that the Secretary-General continue to provide the Division with the necessary resources and to ensure that it continues to carry out its program of work as detailed in relevant earlier resolutions, in consultation with the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (CEIRPP) and under its guidance. Requests that the Secretary General ensure the continued cooperation of the Department of Public Information and other units of the Secretariat in enabling the Division to perform its tasks. Also requests that the Committee on Palestinian Rights and the Division continue to organize the annual exhibit on Palestinian rights or a cultural event, in observance of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People.

Background: The General Assembly established the Division for Palestinian Rights by Resolution 32/40B in 1977.

U.S. Position: The United States believes that the continuation of the Division, which embodies institutional discrimination against Israel, is inconsistent with UN support for the efforts of the Quartet (the United States, the United Nations, Russia, and the European Union) to achieve a just and durable solution of democratic Israeli and Palestinian states living in peace. The activities of this Division continue to promulgate actively a one-sided view of Israeli-Palestinian issues and do not contribute constructively to efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The United States believes this Division should be abolished and actively lobbies other countries to withdraw their support for the annual resolution renewing the Division's mandate.

4. Work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories

**A/Res/62/106**

December 17

93-8(US)-74

Commends the efforts of the Special Committee in performing the tasks assigned to it by the General Assembly. Deplores those policies and practices of Israel that violate the human rights of the Palestinian people and

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

other Arabs of the occupied territories, expresses grave concern about the situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and requests the Special Committee to continue to investigate Israeli policies and practices.

Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Special Committee with all necessary facilities and to continue to make available such staff as may be necessary so that the Special Committee may continue its work.

*Background:* The General Assembly established the Special Committee by Resolution 2443 in 1968.

*U.S. Position:* The United States believes that the continuation of this Committee, which embodies institutional discrimination against Israel, is inconsistent with UN support for the efforts of the Quartet (United States, United Nations, Russia, and the European Union) to achieve a just and durable solution of democratic Israeli and Palestinian states living in peace. The activities of this Committee continue to promulgate actively a one-sided view of Israeli-Palestinian issues and do not contribute constructively to efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The United States believes this Committee should be abolished and actively lobbies other countries to withdraw their support for the annual resolution that renews the Committee's mandate.

## 5. Human Rights Situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

**A/Res/62/167**

December 18

101(US)-22-59

Expresses its very serious concern at the continued refusal of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) to recognize the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the DPRK or to extend cooperation to him, and at continuing reports of systemic, widespread, and grave violations of civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights in the DPRK, including the following: torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, public executions, extrajudicial and arbitrary detention, the absence of due process and the rule of law, the imposition of the death penalty for political and religious reasons, and the existence of a large number of prison camps and the extensive use of forced labor; the situation of refugees and asylum-seekers expelled or returned to the DPRK and sanctions imposed on citizens of the DPRK who have been repatriated from abroad; all-pervasive and severe restrictions on the freedoms of thought, conscience, religion, opinion and expression, peaceful assembly and association, and equal access to information; limitations imposed on every person who wishes to move freely within the country and travel abroad; violations of economic, social, and cultural rights which have led to severe malnutrition, widespread health

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

problems, and other hardship; continuing violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of women; continuing reports of violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of persons with disabilities; and violations of workers' rights, including the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining.

Reiterates its very serious concern at unresolved questions of international concern relating to the abduction of foreigners in the form of an enforced disappearance.

Notes the prompt reaction of the Government of the DPRK to the latest floods and the openness shown in seeking outside assistance, and expresses its very deep concern at the precarious humanitarian situation in the country, compounded by the mismanagement on the part of the authorities. Urges the Government of the DPRK to take preventive and remedial action to facilitate access to humanitarian aid, ensure impartial delivery of humanitarian aid to all parts of the country on the basis of need, and to ensure food security, including through sustainable agriculture.

Strongly urges the Government of the DPRK to respect fully all human rights and fundamental freedoms, and in this regard, to: immediately put an end to the systematic, widespread, and grave human rights violations mentioned above; to tackle the root causes leading to refugee outflows and to criminalize those who exploit refugees by human smuggling, trafficking, and extortion, while not criminalizing the victims; to extend its full cooperation to the Special Rapporteur and other UN human rights mechanisms, including by granting unimpeded access; to engage in technical cooperation activities in the field of human rights with the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights; and to extend to UN agencies and other humanitarian actors all access necessary to allow them to carry out their mandates.

*Background:* The UN Commission on Human Rights established the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the DPRK in 2004; the Human Rights Council extended the Rapporteur's mandate in 2006. His August 2007 report on the situation of human rights in the DPRK raised specific concerns including access to food; rights pertaining to the security of the person, humane treatment and justice; rights pertaining to refugees and those seeking asylum; the rights of vulnerable groups, including in particular women and children, and the trafficking of women; and the failure of the state to protect human rights and freedoms. The report took note of the Six-Party ministerial in July 2007, which followed up on the February 2007 agreement to implement the September 19, 2005, Joint Statement regarding denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. The Special Rapporteur noted that while developments in the area of denuclearization were positive, the Government of the DPRK continued to decline to cooperate with him.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007

U.S. Position: The United States cosponsored this European Union-sponsored resolution. The United States believed that this resolution demonstrated the international community's concern over the human rights situation in the DPRK and the desire to hold the government accountable for its human rights violations and to improve the situation of human rights in the DPRK.

## 6. Human Rights Situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran

**No Action Motion**                      December 18                      80-84(US)-19

The representative of Iran, before the vote on the resolution on the situation of human rights in Iran, called for a no action motion.

Background: In calling for the motion of no action on Resolution 62/168 on the situation of human rights in the Republic of Iran, the representative of Iran argued that his country and the "majority of the international community" believed that the Human Rights Council was the most competent body to consider and monitor human rights, and that therefore the General Assembly's consideration of issues such as those in the resolution was unwarranted.

U.S. Position: The United States has consistently argued that human rights violations must be drawn to the attention of the international community in multiple fora, including the General Assembly, and that the international community must hold perennial human rights violators accountable. This is especially true in the current environment, in which the Human Rights Council, which should be the world's premier human rights body, has failed to hold states accountable for their human rights violations. The United States also opposed this attempt to use a no action motion to prevent consideration of a resolution that had already been referred to the General Assembly by the Third Committee. A similar no action motion on this resolution had already been defeated in the Third Committee.

## 7. Human Rights Situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran

**A/Res/62/168**                      December 18                      73(US)-53-55

Expresses its deep concern at the ongoing systematic violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms by the Government of Islamic Republic of Iran.

Expresses its very serious concern that since the adoption of Resolution 61/176 (the previous resolution on the situation of human rights in Iran), there had been, inter alia, confirmed instances of torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment; public executions; stoning as a method of execution; execution of persons who were under the age of 18 at the

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

time their offence was committed, contrary to Iran's obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; arrests, violent repression, and sentencing of women exercising their right to peaceful assembly, a campaign of intimidation against women's human rights defenders, and continuing discrimination against women and girls in law and practice; increasing discrimination and other human rights violations against persons belonging to religious, ethnic, linguistic, or other minorities, recognized or otherwise; ongoing, systemic, and serious restrictions of freedom of peaceful assembly and association, and freedom of opinion and expression; persistent failure to uphold due process rights, and violations of the rights of detainees, including the systematic and arbitrary use of prolonged solitary confinement.

Calls upon the Government of Iran to respect fully its human rights obligations, and to fully implement prior resolutions of the General Assembly by, in particular: eliminating amputations and flogging and other forms of torture; abolishing public executions and other executions carried out in the absence of respect for internationally recognized safeguards; abolishing the use of stoning as a method of execution; abolishing executions of persons who at the time of their offense were under the age of 18; eliminating all forms of discrimination and other human rights violations against women and girls; eliminating all forms of discrimination and other human rights violations against persons belonging to religious, ethnic, linguistic, or other minorities, recognized or otherwise, and refraining from monitoring individuals on the basis of their religious beliefs, and ensuring that access of minorities to education and employment is on par with that of all Iranians; implementing, inter alia, the 1996 report of the Special Rapporteur on religious intolerance, which recommended ways for the Government of Iran to emancipate the Baha'i community; ending the harassment, intimidation, and persecution of political opponents and human rights defenders, including by releasing political prisoners; upholding due process rights and ending impunity for human rights violations.

Encourages the thematic procedures of the Human Rights Council to visit or otherwise continue their work to improve the situation of human rights in Iran, and urges the Government of Iran to live up to the commitment it made when it issued a standing invitation to special rapporteurs, representatives, and experts.

*Background:* The Government of Iran continued its practices of conducting summary executions in the absence of internationally recognized safeguards; use of torture; discriminatory treatment towards women and girls; and persecution of minorities, journalists, students, academics, and clerics. When the draft resolution came up for a vote in the General Assembly, Iran

*U.S. Position:*

U.S. Position: The United States cosponsored this Canadian-sponsored resolution and lobbied other delegations to vote in favor of the text. The resolution demonstrated the international community's concern over the human rights situation in Iran and the desire to hold the government accountable for its human rights violations and to improve the situation of human rights in Iran.

put forth a proposal to take no action on this resolution. That proposal to adjourn debate was defeated by a vote of 80 to 84(US), with 19 abstentions.

*U.S. Position:* The United States cosponsored this Canadian-sponsored resolution and lobbied other delegations to vote in favor of the text. The resolution demonstrated the international community's concern over the human rights situation in Iran and the desire to hold the government accountable for its human rights violations and to improve the situation of human rights in Iran.

## 8. Human Rights Situation in Belarus

**A/Res/62/169**

December 18

72(US)-33-78

Expresses deep concern about the continued use of the criminal justice system to silence political opposition and human rights defenders, including through arbitrary detention, lack of due process, and closed political trials of these individuals; the failure of the Government of Belarus to cooperate fully with all the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council, while noting the serious concern relating to the continued and systematic violations of human rights in Belarus and the further erosion of the democratic process expressed by seven independent UN human rights experts in their statement of March 29, 2006; that in spite of detailed recommendations by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and dialogue between the government and the OSCE following previous elections, and despite calls from the General Assembly to adopt the recommendations of the OSCE following the flawed presidential elections in 2006, Belarus again failed to meet its commitments to hold free and fair elections during municipal elections in 2007, including by using intimidation and the arbitrary application of registration standards to exclude opposition candidates, severely restricting the access of registered candidates to voters and the mass media, the detention and arrest of political and civil society activists, the negative portrayal in the State media of opposition candidates and activists, and preventing access by independent local observers to polling stations.

Expresses deep concern about the continued use of the arbitrary application of registration standards to prevent non-governmental organizations from operating, including the use of the arbitrary denial of leases and evictions to prevent organizations from acquiring valid addresses; the continued harassment and detention of Belarusian journalists and the suspension and banning of independent media covering local opposition demonstrations, and that senior officials of the government were implicated in the enforced disappearance and/or summary execution of three political opponents of the incumbent authorities in 1999 and of a journalist in 2000, and in the continuing investigatory cover-up, and that the government has ignored calls by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe to account for their disappearance; the failure of the Belarusian authorities to heed calls to

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

reinstate the teaching license of the European Humanities University in Minsk and about the increasing harassment of its students while the university operates in exile; continued persistent reports of harassment and closure of non-governmental organizations, national minority organizations, independent media outlets, religious groups, opposition political parties and independent trade unions, and independent youth and student organizations, and the harassment and prosecutions of individuals, including students and their relatives, engaged in the promotion and protection of human rights, rule of law, and democracy.

Urges the Government of Belarus to release immediately and unconditionally all individuals detained for politically motivated reasons and other individuals detained for exercising or promoting human rights; cease politically-motivated prosecution, harassment, and intimidation of political opponents and pro-democracy activists and human rights defenders, students, independent media, religious organizations, educational institutions, and civil society actors; bring the electoral process and legislative framework into line with international standards and demonstrate such commitment through the parliamentary elections due in 2008; respect the rights to freedom of speech, assembly, and association; suspend from their duties officials implicated in any case of enforced disappearance, summary execution and torture, and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, pending investigation of those cases, and ensure that all necessary measures are taken to investigate fully and impartially such cases and bring the alleged perpetrators to justice, and, if found guilty, ensure that they are punished in accordance with the international human rights obligations of Belarus; uphold the right to freedom of religion or belief; investigate and hold accountable those responsible for the mistreatment and detention of human rights defenders and members of the political opposition; carry out the recommendations of the International Labor Organization Commission with regard to respecting core labor rights of freedom of association for workers; to carry out all other steps called for by the Commission on Human Rights in its Resolution 2005/13 and by the General Assembly in Resolution 61/175.

Insists that the Government of Belarus cooperate fully with all the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council and the OSCE.

*Background:* The situation of human rights in Belarus has been deteriorating since 2003, when the UN Commission on Human Rights adopted its first resolution on human rights in Belarus. Belarus held local elections on January 14, 2007, which did not meet international standards for fairness and transparency.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007

In the Third Committee, Russia put forward a motion to discontinue consideration of this resolution. This no action motion was defeated by a vote of 65 to 79(US), with 31 abstentions.

U.S. Position: The situation in Belarus continued to deteriorate. The Government of Belarus has ignored calls to accord its citizens their basic human rights. Citizens were under constant threat of detention, arrest, and persecution for expressing their political views, or exercising their freedom of religion and assembly; minority groups continued to not be recognized; and civil society and pro-democracy organizations suffered unabated repression. The United States sponsored this resolution to keep world pressure and attention focused on a regime that violated its citizens' human rights. The resolution also provided vital moral support to the Belarusian people, while upholding the values proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

## 9. International Trade and Development

**A/Res/62/184**

December 19

126-48(US)-7

Expresses serious concern at the lack of substantial progress on the trade negotiations of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and considers it a serious setback for the Doha round of trade negotiations, and calls upon the developed countries to demonstrate the flexibility and political will necessary for breaking the current impasse. Stresses that in order for the Doha round to be concluded satisfactorily, the negotiations should result in the establishment of rules and disciplines in the area of agriculture, adhering to the development mandate of the Doha Ministerial Declaration (2001), the decision of the General Council of the WTO (2004), and the Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration (2005).

Also stresses the need for negotiations of the WTO in non-agricultural market access to live up to the development mandate of the Doha Ministerial Declaration, the decision of the General Council of the WTO, and the Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration. Further stresses the need for WTO negotiations to make substantial progress in all areas under the single undertaking such as services, rules, and trade facilitation so as to ensure that the development concerns of developing countries are fully reflected in any outcomes, consistent with the declarations and decisions noted above.

Expresses its deep concern at the imposition of laws and other forms of coercive economic measures, including unilateral sanctions against developing countries, which undermine international law and the rules of the WTO, and also severely threaten the freedom of trade and investment. Reaffirms the commitments made at the Fourth Ministerial Conference of the WTO and at the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries. In this regard, calls upon developed countries that have not already

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

done so to provide immediate, predictable, duty-free and quota-free market access on a lasting basis to all products originating from all least developed countries by 2008. Also calls upon developing countries that are in a position to do so to extend duty-free and quota-free market access to exports of these countries, and in this context reaffirms the need to consider additional measures for progressive improvement in market access for least developed countries. Reaffirms further the need for WTO members to take additional measures to provide effective market access both at the border and otherwise.

Also reaffirms the commitment to actively pursue the work program of the WTO with respect to addressing the trade-related issues and concerns affecting the fuller integration of countries with small, vulnerable economies into the multilateral trading system in a manner commensurate with their special circumstances and in support of their efforts towards sustainable development.

Also recognizes the need to ensure that the comparative advantage of developing countries is not undermined by any form of protectionism, including the arbitrary and abusive use of non-tariff measures, non-trade barriers, and other standards to unfairly restrict the access of developing countries' products to developed countries' markets. Reaffirms in this regard that developing countries should play an increasing role in the formulation of, among other things, safety, environment, and health standards. Recognizes the need to facilitate the increased and meaningful participation of the developing countries in the work of relevant international standard-setting organizations.

Welcomes the convening of the twelfth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in Accra, Ghana, from April 20-25, 2008.

Background: Recommended to the General Assembly by the Second Committee, this proposal from the Group of 77 dealt with, among other things, the Doha Declaration adopted at the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference in 2001 and negotiations that led up to the sixth WTO Ministerial in December 2005. The number of countries voting against the resolution increased sharply from 2006 to 2007, from two in 2006 to 48 countries in 2007. Most of these were countries who switched from abstaining to voting no. Country representatives expressed concern with the resolution's "unbalanced language," arguing that it did not accurately portray positive advances achieved in the Doha round.

U.S. Position: The United States is a leading advocate of trade liberalization and had hoped that the UN resolution on trade and development would encourage progress on the Doha agenda. This resolution contains several attempts to dictate the terms of resumption and the terms of the

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

outcome of the negotiations in the WTO. For the fourth year in a row, the United States voted no on this resolution.

## 10. Agricultural Technology for Development

**A/Res/62/190**

December 19

147(US)-0-30

Calls upon member states and relevant United Nations (UN) organizations to make greater efforts to promote the development and transfer of appropriate technologies to developing countries under fair, transparent, and mutually agreed terms, as well as to support national efforts to foster the effective utilization of local know-how and technology, and to promote agricultural research and technologies to enable poor rural men and women to increase agricultural productivity and enhanced food security. Urges the relevant bodies of the UN system to support the efforts of member states, in particular developing countries, to take full advantage of new knowledge in agricultural technology, agricultural innovation, research and development to achieve relevant Millennium Development Goals by 2015, specifically the eradication of poverty and hunger.

Calls upon public and private institutions to further develop improved varieties of crops that are appropriate for various regions, especially those challenged by environmental factors, including climate change, and to develop and manage these crops in a sustainable manner, and calls for further efforts by all stakeholders to ensure that improved crop varieties are made available and affordable to smallholder farmers in a manner consistent with national regulations and relevant international agreements. Invites member states and relevant regional and international organizations to allocate financial and technical resources to support the development of efficient, productive, and environmentally sound technologies for sustainable agriculture in developing countries. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its 64<sup>th</sup> session a report on the implementation of the present resolution.

*Background:* This marks the first non Holocaust-related resolution introduced by Israel and adopted by the General Assembly (in 2000, Israel introduced a resolution on Holocaust remembrance – A/Res/60/7 – that was adopted by consensus). While some delegations from countries that traditionally oppose Israel in the United Nations abstained on the vote for the agricultural technology and development resolution, it is noteworthy that no country voted against the resolution. The resolution largely avoided politicized voting through its emphasis on the universally appealing goal of agricultural improvement and importance to key members of the G-77.

*U.S. Position:* The United States supports efforts to increase agricultural technology and innovation, including the use of biotechnology for drought and disease resistant crops, and its potential in developing countries to increase rural incomes while reducing hunger and poverty. The United States, among the first cosponsors of the resolution, welcomed Israel's input on this

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

matter, as well as many member states' willingness to put aside political concerns in order to produce a valuable resolution.

## 11. Report of the Human Rights Council

**A/Res/62/219**

December 22

150-7(US)-1

Taking note of the resolutions adopted by the Human Rights Council on June 18, 2007: Resolution 5/1, "Institution-building of the United Nations Human Rights Council," and Resolution 5/2, "Code of Conduct for Special Procedures Mandate-holders of the Human Rights Council," endorses the decision of the Council to adopt these resolutions, including the annexes and appendices thereto.

*Background:* The circumstances surrounding the adoption of Resolution 5/1 by the Human Rights Council were deeply problematic. The institution-building package was concerning because it terminated the mandates of human rights rapporteurs for Cuba and Belarus, whose governments are perennial human rights violators, and made Israel the only country subject to a permanent Council agenda item. When the institution-building package was proposed in Council in June 2007, procedural irregularities denied members the right to an up or down vote, which Canada had intended to call.

*U.S. Position:* The Human Rights Council was intended to be the world's leading human rights protection mechanism. The United States, however, has been deeply disappointed by its performance to date, including the adoption of the seriously flawed institution-building package on June 18, 2007.

We had hoped that the General Assembly would address the deficiencies that prevent the Council from acting effectively, rather than endorsing its adoption of the institution-building package. Our refusal to endorse the package resulted in our "no" vote on this resolution in the General Assembly.

## 12. Human Rights Situation in Myanmar (Burma)

**A/Res/62/222**

December 22

83(US)-22-47

Expresses grave concern at the ongoing systematic violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms of the people of Myanmar (Burma), as described in Resolution 61/232 and previous resolutions of the General Assembly, the Commission on Human Rights, and the Human Rights Council; the arbitrary detentions, including the use of physical violence, in response to peaceful protests, and the extension of the house arrest of Aung San Suu Kyi; the major and repeated violations of international humanitarian law committed against civilians, as denounced by the International Committee of the Red

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

Cross in June 2007; the discrimination and violations suffered by persons belonging to ethnic nationalities of Myanmar (Burma), and attacks by military forces and non-State armed groups on villages in Karen and other ethnic States, leading to extensive forced displacements; the absence of effective and genuine participation of the representatives of the National League for Democracy and other political parties; and the continuous deterioration of living conditions and the increase of poverty affecting a significant part of the population.

Welcomes the reports of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar (Burma), following his being allowed to visit the country after four years of being denied access; the report of the Secretary-General and his designation of a Special Adviser (Ibrahim Gambari) to continue to pursue his mandate of good offices, and the Special Adviser's two visits to Myanmar (Burma); the conclusion between the International Labor Organization and the Government of Myanmar (Burma) of an understanding designed to provide a mechanism to enable victims of forced labor to seek redress; the role of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and of neighboring countries in encouraging the Government of Myanmar (Burma) to resume its efforts at national reconciliation; and the appointment by the Government of Myanmar (Burma) of a minister for relations with Aung San Suu Kyi and their two meetings.

Strongly calls upon the Government of Myanmar (Burma) to ensure full respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms and to bring to justice perpetrators of human rights violations; to seriously consider the recommendations of the Special Adviser during his October 2007 visit, and to fully implement the previous recommendations of UN bodies; to exercise the utmost restraint and to desist from further arrests and violence against peaceful protestors, and to immediately and unconditionally release all those arbitrarily detained as well as political prisoners, including National League for Democracy leaders Aung San Suu Kyi and Tin Oo; to lift all restraints on peaceful political activity of all persons; to cooperate fully with the Special Rapporteur and ensure that no person cooperating with the Special Rapporteur or any international organization is subjected to any form of intimidation, harassment, or punishment; to ensure immediately the safe and unhindered access to all parts of Myanmar (Burma) by the UN and international humanitarian organizations; to put an immediate end to the continuing recruitment and use of child soldiers and intensify measures to ensure the protection of children affected by armed conflict; and to take urgent measures to put an end to the military operations targeting civilians in the ethnic areas and the associated human rights and humanitarian law violations and to end the systematic forced displacement of large numbers of persons and other causes of refugee flows to neighboring countries.

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Calls upon the Government of Myanmar (Burma) to permit all political representatives and representatives of ethnic nationalities to participate fully in the political transition process without restrictions; to pursue through dialogue and peaceful means the immediate suspension and permanent end of conflict with all ethnic nationalities in Myanmar (Burma) and allow the full participation of representatives of all political parties and representatives of ethnic nationalities; to fulfill its obligations to restore the independence of the judiciary and due process of law; to cooperate fully with the good offices mission of the Special Adviser of the Secretary-General, including by agreeing to his visits and allowing unrestricted access; to engage in a dialogue with the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights; to continue its efforts with the International Labor Organization; to allow human rights defenders to pursue their activities unhindered and ensure their safety; to refrain from imposing restrictions on access to and flow of information from the people of Myanmar (Burma), including through the Internet and mobile phone services; and to allow the International Committee of the Red Cross to carry out its humanitarian activities, particularly by granting immediate access to persons detained.

*Background:* Myanmar's (Burma's) rights record worsened considerably in 2007, with the government enacting a brutal crackdown on peaceful protestors, including monks, women, and children. In part in response to international outrage following the crackdown, Myanmar authorities allowed the Special Rapporteur to visit the country for the first time since November 2003, allowed the newly named Special Adviser of the Secretary-General two visits, and named a liaison of the government to Aung San Suu Kyi. Access for both the Special Rapporteur and the Special Adviser was limited, and meetings between the liaison and Aung San Suu Kyi did not deliver any positive outcomes.

On October 11, the Security Council issued a Presidential Statement on Myanmar (Burma), strongly deploring the use of violence against peaceful demonstrations and stressing the need for the Government of Myanmar (Burma) to create the necessary conditions for a genuine dialogue with Aung San Suu Kyi and all concerned parties.

*U.S. Position:* The Burmese regime's policies of political repression, forced relocations, massive human rights violations, military offensives against ethnic minorities, restrictions on international humanitarian organizations, and the use of rape as a tool of political intimidation have resulted in the destabilizing outflow of over a million Burmese to neighboring countries; the tearing of the fabric of Burmese society such that cross-border trafficking in narcotics and persons have flourished; the unchecked spread of communicable diseases such as HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis; and the internal displacement of between 500,000 and 1 million people. The United

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007

States believes that the adoption of this resolution keeps world pressure and attention focused on a regime that egregiously violates its citizens' human rights.

13. Questions Relating to the Proposed Programme Budget for the Biennium 2008-2009

**A/Res/62/236**

December 22

142-1(US)-0

Reaffirms the role of the General Assembly, through the Fifth Committee, in the analysis and approval of financial resources; refers to the proposed program budget for the biennium 2008-2009; endorses the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

Reaffirms the established budgetary procedures and methodology; notes with concern the piecemeal approach to the budget process, and requests the Secretary-General, for all future proposed program budgets, to take the necessary steps to avoid such an approach and ensure the fullest possible picture of the Organization's requirements for future bienniums.

Background: This resolution outlines the General Assembly's endorsement of the 2008-2009 program budget, with specific references to policy, human resource, and programmatic issues. The United States called for a vote on this resolution because of our concern over the "piecemeal" and "ad hoc" approach the Secretary-General had taken in constructing the budget. We were concerned that this approach could result in the final budget being significantly higher than the budget proposed in Resolution 62/237 (see #11 in the following section).

U.S. Position: In underscoring its concern, the United States made specific reference to the possibility that such an open-ended budgeting process could allow the Durban Review Conference to be funded out of the UN regular budget. The United States believes this conference is likely to be fundamentally and fatally flawed by the same anti-Israel tone that marked the first World Conference on Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance, which took place in Durban, South Africa, in September 2001.

## IMPORTANT CONSENSUS ACTIONS

The 11 important consensus resolutions are listed and described below. For each resolution, the listing provides a short title, the document number, and date adopted. A summary of each resolution is provided ("General Assembly" is the subject of the verbs in the first paragraph), followed by background on the resolution and an explanation of the U.S.

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

position. The resolutions are listed in order by date and then in numerical order.

1. Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency

**A/Res/62/2**

October 29

Notes with appreciation the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Annual Report for 2006.

Takes note of resolutions adopted by the IAEA's General Conference, held from September 17-21 2007, on measures to strengthen international cooperation in nuclear, radiation, and transport safety and waste management; progress on measures to protect against nuclear and radiological terrorism; strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities; strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications, including non-power and power nuclear applications; strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of the safeguards system and the application of the Model Additional Protocol; the implementation of the agreement between the IAEA and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for the application of safeguards in connection with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; the application of IAEA safeguards in the Middle East; personnel, including issues related to IAEA secretariat staffing and women in the secretariat; and on decisions on the amendments to Article VI and Article XIV(a) of the IAEA Statute.

Reaffirms its strong support for the IAEA's indispensable role in encouraging and assisting the development and practical application of atomic energy for peaceful uses, in technology transfer to developing countries, and in nuclear safety, verification, and security.

Appeals to member states to continue to support the activities of the Agency and requests that the Secretary-General transmit to the IAEA Director General the records of the sixty-second session of the General Assembly relating to IAEA activities.

Background: During the previous three years, a similar resolution on the IAEA had required a recorded vote. This year's adoption of the resolution by consensus signaled growing international support for the IAEA and its activities.

U.S. Position: The IAEA serves critical U.S. national security policy goals related to the nonproliferation of nuclear material; the prevention of nuclear terrorism; the promotion of safe and secure use of nuclear energy; the peaceful application of nuclear science and technology in fields of energy, environment, health, and agriculture, among others; and to cooperation in key areas of nuclear science and technology. The United States strongly supports

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

the IAEA and is the Agency's largest contributor with regard to both the IAEA regular budget and voluntary contributions.

## 2. The Rule of Law at the National and International Levels

**A/Res/62/70**

December 6

Reiterates its request that the Secretary-General prepare an inventory of the current activities of the various organs, bodies, offices, departments, funds, and programs within the UN system devoted to the promotion of the rule of law for submission at the General Assembly's 63<sup>rd</sup> session, and welcomes the interim report submitted at its 62<sup>nd</sup> session. Also reiterates its request that the Secretary-General seek the views of member states on ways to strengthen and coordinate the activities listed in the inventory and to submit a report on this issue to the General Assembly at its 63<sup>rd</sup> session.

Invites the International Court of Justice, the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, and the International Law Commission to comment, in their respective reports to the General Assembly, on their current roles in promoting the rule of law. Notes with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General entitled, "Uniting our strengths: enhancing United Nations support for the rule of law."

Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its 63<sup>rd</sup> session the item entitled "The rule of law at the national and international levels."

*Background:* This agenda item was first included in the agenda of the General Assembly during its 61<sup>st</sup> session, at the suggestion of Liechtenstein and Mexico. These states characterized their proposal as a follow-up to the 2005 World Summit Outcome document, which noted the need for "universal adherence to and implementation of the rule of law at both the national and international levels." Furthermore, they stressed the importance of the United Nations in the international legal system and, as a prerequisite for improving the UN's effectiveness, of the need to establish a systematic inventory of the rule of law programs of UN bodies.

*U.S. Position:* The United States believes in the value and importance of international law and welcomed the discussion on the rule of law in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly. The United States joined consensus on this resolution.

## 3. Protection of Global Climate for Present and Future Generations of Mankind

**A/Res/62/86**

December 10

Stresses the seriousness of climate change, and calls upon states to work cooperatively towards achieving the ultimate objective of the United

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), stabilizing greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that prevents dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system, through the implementation of its provisions.

Recognizes that climate change poses serious risks and challenges to all countries, particularly to developing countries, and calls upon states to take urgent global action to address climate change in accordance with the principles identified in the UNFCCC, including the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, and, in this regard, urges all countries to fully implement their commitments under the UNFCCC, to take effective and concrete actions and measures at all levels, and to enhance international cooperation in the UNFCCC. Also recognizes the need to provide financial and technical resources, as well as capacity-building and access to and transfer of technology, to assist those developing countries adversely affected by climate change.

Requests that the Secretary-General make provisions for the sessions of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC and its subsidiary bodies in his proposal for the program budget for the biennium 2008-2009. Invites the secretariat of the UNFCCC to report, through the Secretary-General, to the General Assembly at its 63<sup>rd</sup> session on the work of the Conference of the Parties. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its sixty-third session the sub-item entitled, “Protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind.”

*Background:* The climate change resolution and its language on budgetary support have been recurrent in previous UN sessions. UNFCCC entered into force on March 21, 1994, to determine ways to reduce global warming and to cope with any temperature increases. It has been ratified by 192 countries, including the United States. The Kyoto Protocol, an international agreement to reduce greenhouse gases emissions, entered into force on February 16, 2005.

The Government of Indonesia hosted a UN conference on climate change in Bali from December 3-14, 2007. The Roadmap, agreed to by all UNFCCC parties at the conference, achieves key U.S. objectives of establishing a negotiating process with a clear end date, and of securing a commitment from developing countries as well as developed countries to consider meaningful actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It also established elements for a future international agreement to replace the Kyoto Protocol, which expires in 2012. The Government of Poland has offered to host the 14<sup>th</sup> session of the Conference of the Parties and the 4<sup>th</sup> session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, in Poznan in December 2008.

*U.S. Position*

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

*U.S. Position:* The United States recognizes the long-term challenge of global climate change and is committed to taking action on climate change at home and abroad. The United States is a party to the UNFCCC, but is not a party to its Kyoto Protocol. On May 31, 2007, President Bush announced a new initiative to develop and contribute to a post-2012 framework on energy security and climate change by the end of 2008. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice hosted the first of a series of Major Economies Meetings to this end in Washington, D.C. in September 2007. With regard to this resolution specifically, the United States and Japan called for a vote on Operative Paragraph 11 of the resolution, by which the Assembly would “request the Secretary-General to make provisions for the sessions of the Conference of Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and its subsidiary bodies in his proposals for the programme budget for the biennium of the 2008-2009.” The call for a vote was due to concerns about the budgetary implications of the paragraph. The paragraph was retained by a vote of 162 in favor to 2 against (Japan and the United States), with no abstentions. The Assembly then adopted the draft resolution as a whole without a vote.

#### 4. Declaration of the Commemorative High-level Plenary Meeting Devoted to the Follow-up to the Outcome of the Special Session on Children

**A/Res/62/88**

December 13

The representatives of states gathered at the commemorative high-level plenary meeting of the General Assembly are encouraged by the progress achieved since 2002 in creating a world fit for children. Fewer children under five are dying each year, more children are in school than ever before, and more education opportunities are being equally extended to girls and boys. More medicines are available for children. More laws, policies, and plans are in place to protect children from violence, abuse, and exploitation.

Challenges persist, however, including poverty, high child death rates, malnutrition, pandemics, including HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, and other preventable diseases, and lack of access to education. A large number of children are still subject to violence, exploitation, and abuse, as well as to inequity and discrimination, in particular against the girl child. Representatives will work to break the cycle of poverty, achieve internationally agreed development goals, create an environment that is conducive to the well-being of children, and realize all the rights of the child.

The representatives reaffirm their commitment to the full implementation of the Declaration and Plan of Action contained in the outcome document of the 27<sup>th</sup> special session of the General Assembly on children, entitled, “A world fit for children.” The representatives reaffirm their determination to pursue the agreed global targets and actions for

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

mobilizing resources for children, in accordance with “A world fit for children.”

The representatives will strive to strengthen children’s participation in the decisions that affect them. They also renew their political will to intensify efforts towards building a world fit for children.

*Background:* On December 11-12, 2007, the General Assembly held a plenary meeting on progress in following up on the General Assembly’s March 8-10, 2002, special session on children. The 2002 special session committed governments to time-bound goals for children and young people.

*U.S. Position:* The United States is committed to helping combat disease, increase access to education, and prevent the abuse of children. We joined consensus on this declaration, pleased with how it addressed the real needs and interests of children in these areas. In our explanation of vote we called particular attention to the declaration’s recognition that children need the care and attention of their parents, recalling the recognition in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that the family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society. We also noted that the term “all the rights of the child” is synonymous with “all the rights of children” and “all children’s rights,” and that the phrase “the fulfillment of obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child” refers only to the fulfillment by States Parties of their obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child, since non-Parties have no obligations under the Convention. The United States signed the Convention on the Rights of the Child on February 16, 1995, but has not ratified it and is therefore not a Party to the Convention.

### 5. Eliminating Rape and Other Forms of Sexual Violence in All Their Manifestations, Including in Conflict and Related Situations

**A/Res62/134**

December 18

Urges states to take special measures to protect women and girls from gender-based violence, in particular rape and other forms of sexual violence; to end impunity by ensuring that all rape victims, particularly women and girls, have equal protection under the law and equal access to justice, and by investigating, prosecuting, and punishing any person responsible for rape and other forms of sexual violence, whether or not committed by state or non-state actors in the course of achieving political or military objectives, wherever they occur, whether or not in the course of an international or non-international armed conflict; to provide victims with access to appropriate health care; to develop, implement, and monitor the implementation of a comprehensive and integrated strategy of prevention and prosecution of rape; to promote human rights education, including on all aspects of rape and other forms of sexual

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

violence; to increase significantly their voluntary financial support for activities related to preventing and eliminating all forms of violence against women; and to consider ratifying or acceding to all human rights treaties, including, as a matter of priority, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, and the Optional Protocol thereof.

Calls upon states and the United Nations system to support all efforts to address rape, including through the regular collection, analysis, and dissemination of data, to facilitate such efforts and, in particular, to work towards overcoming the difficulties and challenges of capacity building and collecting information on the practice; to integrate to the maximum extent possible the needs of all victims of sexual violence into UN humanitarian assistance programs; and to assign adequate resources within the UN system to those bodies responsible for the promotion of gender equality and women's rights, and to efforts throughout the UN system to eliminate violence against women and girls, and to design programs to provide assistance to victims, including children born as a result.

Urges states, in cooperation with the private sector, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and other civil society actors, as appropriate, to conduct public education and awareness campaigns at the national and grass-roots levels in order to raise awareness about the causes and consequences of rape and other forms of sexual violence; to establish reception centers and shelters for victims, and take other appropriate measures to promote and protect women's rights, in cooperation with state efforts towards protecting and supporting victims; to support programs to eliminate rape and other forms of sexual violence in all their manifestations, and design programs to provide assistance to all victims of rape; and to address the long-term consequences faced by victims of rape and other forms of sexual violence, including legal discrimination and social stigmatization, as well as the effects on children born as a result of rape.

Requests that the Secretary-General report to the General Assembly at its 63<sup>rd</sup> session on the implementation of the present resolution on rape and other forms of sexual violence in all their manifestations, including when they target victims associated with communities, ethnic groups or other groups regarded as antagonistic to or insufficiently supportive of the group or entity whose forces commit the crime, and are calculated to humiliate, instill fear in, disperse and/or forcibly relocate members of such groups, including, but not limited to, the victims and their families.

*Background:* While the General Assembly had adopted a resolution on violence against women on December 19, 2006, this was the first resolution focusing specifically on rape and sexual violence. During prior years, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights have also adopted resolutions on women and violence. Also, in March 2007, the UN created the inter-agency initiative, "Stop Rape Now: United Nations Action against Sexual Violence in Conflict."

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

*U.S. Position:* The United States believes that rape under any circumstance is an atrocious act and that it is necessary to increase efforts to address the issue. The original U.S. draft resolution focused primarily on the use of government-condoned rape for military objectives. During the course of negotiations, the text evolved into a more general condemnation of all types of sexual violence, while several key provisions of the original U.S. text were retained. When the draft text of this resolution was discussed in the Third Committee, the U.S. representative noted that greater weight on the use of rape for military objectives would have been preferred, but welcomed the paragraphs on impunity and help for rape victims and the Secretary-General's report, which will focus on rape committed in circumstances that suggest the act is being used as a tactic of conflict or oppression.

**6. Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment**

**A/Res/62/148**

December 18

Condemns all forms of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, including through intimidation, which are and shall remain prohibited at any time and in any place whatsoever and can thus never be justified. Calls upon all states to implement fully the absolute prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment. Emphasizes that states must take persistent, determined, and effective measures to prevent and combat torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, including their gender-based manifestations, and stresses that all acts of torture must be made offences under domestic criminal law. Also emphasizes the importance of states ensuring proper follow-up to the recommendations and conclusions of the relevant treaty bodies and mechanisms.

Condemns any action or attempt by states or public officials to legalize, authorize, or acquiesce in torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment under any circumstances, including on grounds of national security or through judicial decisions. Stresses that all allegations of torture or other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment must be promptly and impartially examined by the competent national authority. Stresses that those who encourage, order, tolerate, or perpetrate acts of torture must be held responsible and severely punished. Calls upon states that are parties to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment to fulfill their obligations to submit for prosecution or extradite those who alleged to have committed acts of torture. Encourages all states to ensure that persons convicted of torture have no subsequent involvement in the treatment of any arrested or detained person. Emphasizes that acts of torture in armed conflict are serious violations of international humanitarian law and in this regard

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

constitute war crimes, that acts of torture can constitute crimes against humanity, and that the perpetrators of all acts of torture must be prosecuted and punished.

Strongly urges states to ensure that any statement that is established to have been made as a result of torture shall not be invoked as evidence in any proceedings, except as evidence against a person accused of torture. Urges states not to expel, return (refouler), extradite, or in any other way transfer a person to another state where there are substantial grounds for believing that the person would be in danger of being subjected to torture, and recognizes that diplomatic assurances, where used, do not release states from their obligations under international law, in particular the principle of non-refoulement.

Calls upon all states to take appropriate effective legislative, administrative, judicial, and other measures to prevent and prohibit the production, trade, export, and use of equipment that is specifically designed to inflict torture or other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment.

Urges all states that have not yet done so to become parties to the Convention against Torture as a matter of priority, and urges states that are parties to comply strictly with their obligations under the Convention. Calls upon all states to cooperate with and assist the Special Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council on torture in the performance of his task.

*Background:* Denmark traditionally sponsors this resolution, which the U.S. generally cosponsors.

*U.S. Position:* This year, the United States cosponsored this resolution with many countries. U.S. criminal law and treaty obligations prohibit torture, and the United States will not engage in or condone torture anywhere. The United States is a party to the Convention against Torture.

## 7. External Debt and Development: Towards a Durable Solution to the Debt Problems of Developing Countries

**A/Res/62/186**

December 19

Emphasizes the special importance of a timely, effective, comprehensive, and durable solution to the debt problems of developing countries, since debt financing and relief can contribute to economic growth and development. Also emphasizes that creditors and debtors must share responsibility for preventing unsustainable debt situations.

Notes with appreciation the progress under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative and Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI), calls for their full and timely implementation and the provision of additional

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

resources to ensure that the financial capacity of the international financial institutions is not reduced, and stresses the need for all creditors to participate on an equitable basis, including non-Paris Club and commercial creditors. Emphasizes, in this regard, that debt relief does not replace other sources of financing.

Urges donors to ensure that their commitments to the MDRI and the HIPC Debt Initiative are additional to existing aid flows, emphasizes that full compensation by donors on the basis of fair burden-sharing for the MDRI costs of relevant financial institutions is essential, calls for continued support to countries to complete the HIPC Debt Initiative process, and encourages all parties, both creditors and debtors, to fulfill their commitments as rapidly as possible in order to complete the debt relief process.

Notes with concern that, in spite of the progress achieved, some countries that have reached the completion point of the HIPC Debt Initiative have not been able to achieve lasting debt sustainability, stresses the importance of promoting responsible borrowing and lending and the need to help those countries to manage their borrowing and to avoid a build-up of unsustainable debt. Encourages further improvement in the mutual exchange of information on a voluntary basis, on borrowing and lending among all creditors and borrowers.

Calls for the consideration of additional measures and initiatives aimed at ensuring long-term debt sustainability through increased grant-based financing, cancellation of 100 percent of the eligible official multilateral and bilateral debt of HIPCs and, where appropriate and on a case-by-case basis, significant debt relief or restructuring for low- and middle-income developing countries with an unsustainable debt burden that are not part of the HIPC Debt Initiative, as well as the exploration of mechanisms to comprehensively address the debt problems of those countries. Encourages the Paris Club, in dealing with the debt of low- and middle-income debtor countries that are not part of the HIPC Debt Initiative to take into account their medium-term debt sustainability in addition to their financing gaps.

Invites creditors and debtors to continue to use, where appropriate and on a case-by-case basis, mechanisms such as debt swaps for alleviating the debt burden of low- and middle-income developing countries with an unsustainable debt burden that are not eligible for the HIPC Debt Initiative. Invites donor countries, taking into account country-specific debt sustainability analyses, to continue their efforts to increase bilateral grants to developing countries, which could contribute to debt sustainability in the medium to long term, and recognizes the need for countries to be able to invest in health and education while maintaining debt sustainability.

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

Invites the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, in cooperation with the regional commissions, development banks, and other relevant multilateral financial institutions and stakeholders, to continue cooperation in respect of capacity-building activities in developing countries in the area of debt management and debt sustainability. Invites the international community, including the UN system, to continue efforts to increase financial support in respect of capacity building activities for developing countries in the area of debt management and debt sustainability, and encourages countries to create transparent and accountable debt management systems.

Calls upon all member states and the UN system, and invites the Bretton Woods institutions and the private sector, to take appropriate measures and actions for the implementation of the commitments, agreements, and decisions of the major UN conferences and summits, in particular those related to the question of the external debt problems of developing countries. Requests that the Secretary-General submit to the General Assembly at its 63<sup>rd</sup> session a report on the implementation of the present resolution and to include in that report a comprehensive and substantive analysis of the external debt situation and debt-servicing problems of developing countries and a review of debt management capacity-building efforts, particularly those of the UN system.

*Background:* Following its submission, it became clear to the United States that the resolution's original title, "External Debt Crisis," and much of its language was dated and inappropriate in that they failed to reflect recent improvements in the global debt situation. The U.S. negotiators led the campaign to update the language and title, and gained support from other member states. The resolution as adopted included a more accurate title and balanced language.

The HIPC Debt Initiative of the IMF and World Bank began in 1996 to help developing countries avoid becoming overburdened by unmanageable debt. In order to help reach the objectives of the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the MDRI was created in 2005. This initiative proposes 100 percent cancellation of debt claims for countries that reach the completion point under the HIPC Debt Initiative.

*U.S. Position:* The United States and other like-minded member states were successful in changing the tone of the original draft resolution to reflect the world's emergence from the debt crisis, and to place an emphasis on the need for developing countries to take responsibility for their debt management. The United States has been a leader in providing billions towards debt relief, including relief beyond the HIPC Debt Initiative framework. The United States has also supported an increase in grant-based

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

financing, but recognizes that debt challenges facing both individual countries and the international community remain.

**8. Preventing and Combating Corrupt Practices and Transfer of Assets of Illicit Origin and Returning Such Assets, in Particular to the Countries of Origin, Consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption**

**A/Res/62/202**

December 19

Takes note of the Secretary-General's report (A/62/116), which provided an account of the first session of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), held in Amman from December 10 - 14, 2006, and summarized ongoing initiatives to coordinate international action against corruption.

Expresses concern about the magnitude of corruption at all levels, including the scale of the transfer of assets of illicit origin derived from corruption. In this regard reiterates the General Assembly's commitment to preventing and combating corrupt practices at all levels. Condemns corruption in all its forms, including bribery, money-laundering, and the transfer of assets of illicit origin, and encourages all governments to prevent, combat, and penalize corruption in all its forms, and to work for the prompt return of assets.

Invites states to work on the identification and tracing of financial flows linked to corruption, the freezing or seizing of assets derived from corruption, and the return of such assets, and encourages human and institutional capacity-building to this end. Stresses the importance of mutual legal assistance and encourages states to enhance international cooperation. Welcomes the high number of states that have already ratified or acceded to the Convention and urges all states to consider doing the same.

Urges all states to abide by the principles of proper management of public affairs and public property, fairness, responsibility and equality before the law and the need to safeguard integrity and to foster a culture of transparency, accountability, and rejection of corruption. Calls for further international cooperation through the UN system to support efforts to prevent and combat corrupt practices and the transfer of assets of illicit origin.

Encourages all states that have not yet done so require financial institutions to properly implement comprehensive due diligence and vigilance programs. Calls upon the private sector to remain fully engaged in the fight against corruption.

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

*Background:* The UN Convention against Corruption is the most comprehensive international anticorruption instrument, and as such has become the focal point for anticorruption efforts worldwide. Its provisions cover topics such as criminalizing corrupt behavior (including bribery, money laundering, and embezzlement), preventing corruption (through measures to promote integrity within government and the private sector), and improving law enforcement cooperation. UNCAC also contains a groundbreaking chapter on facilitating the return of illicitly acquired assets that have been laundered abroad. UNCAC created a Conference of the States Parties (COSP) to promote implementation, including reviewing implementation. The Second COSP met in Bali, Indonesia, from January 28 - February 1, 2008.

*U.S. Position:* The United States became a Party to the convention on October 30, 2006. The United States is supporting global implementation of the Convention by promoting its benefits in various multilateral fora, including the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the G8, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). This is part of the United States' larger effort to build anticorruption experience and capacity worldwide. The Conference of States Parties and the UNCAC process are the appropriate fora for advancing the very technical cooperation that anticorruption measures require. We have generally opposed using UN General Assembly resolutions to politicize the anticorruption issue, as has been attempted in the past, with some states trying to portray those countries that serve as financial centers as being complicit in the loss of assets through corruption.

While we have had success on that front, during the negotiations for this resolution, the United States was unsuccessful in our efforts to change the title and portions of the text, which do not accurately reflect the principles and language of UNCAC. Specifically, the title and portions of the resolution text repeatedly condemn the "transfer" of assets of illicit origin, treating all transfers of such funds as a form of corruption that should be criminalized. This is inconsistent with the spirit of UNCAC.

In addition, the United States once again sought to eliminate the request for the Secretary-General to provide a report on corruption. The past two resolutions on this topic, and this one as well, provide an overly broad mandate for a report that is considered by most to be of negligible value, and which can duplicate reporting by the COSP. The United States, along with the European Union and Canada, faced solid opposition from Group of 77 countries, which sought the retention of this language. A compromise was agreed upon to allow the report to go forward with the understanding that it will not overlap with the COSP outcome report or other documentation, and whatever is written will be done within existing resources. No extrabudgetary resources will be devoted to the creation of this report.

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

As the UNCAC is the foremost anticorruption treaty, as we do not wish to see it undermined or politicized by resolutions in the General Assembly, the United States urged other member states to recognize the primacy of the UNCAC and its COSP process and not re-introduce this resolution at the 63<sup>rd</sup> session; the resolution as adopted, while calling for the inclusion of an anticorruption agenda item for the 63<sup>rd</sup> session, also allows for “the possibility of reviewing the future consideration of this sub-item.”

**9. Financing of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur**

**A/Res/62/232**

December 22

Requests that the Secretary-General entrust the Head of Mission with the task of formulating future budget proposals in full accordance with the provisions of General Assembly Resolutions 59/296 of June 22, 2005, 60/266 of June 20, 2006, and 61/276 of June 29, 2007, as well as other relevant resolutions. Expresses concern at the financial situation with regard to peacekeeping activities, in particular as regards the reimbursements to troop contributors owing to overdue payments by member states of their assessments. Also expresses concern at the delay experienced by the Secretary-General in deploying and providing adequate resources to some recent peacekeeping missions, in particular those in Africa. Also recalls that the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID) should have a primarily African character.

Reaffirms, in the context of all Security Council decisions on peacekeeping operations, the prerogatives of the General Assembly in issues related to administrative and budgetary matters. Decides to establish thirteen posts for the conduct and discipline team and fourteen positions to be funded from general temporary assistance. Requests that the Secretary-General ensure that the financial regulations and rules of the United Nations are abided by and fully upheld in all phases of UNAMID.

Further requests that the Secretary-General further explore, without prejudice to the distinct mandates, resources, roles, and areas of operation of the United Nations Mission in the Sudan and UNAMID, the scope for synergies and cooperation between the two missions, where possible, and to report thereon to the General Assembly for its consideration in the context of the budgets of the missions for the period from July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009.

Requests that the Secretary-General include in his 2008/09 budget submission details of the mechanisms that exist at Headquarters and in the field for ensuring coordination and collaboration among all UN actors active in the relevant mission area. Also requests that the Secretary-General ensure that future budgets for UNAMID contain sufficient information, explanation, and justification of the proposed resource requirements relating to its operational costs in order to allow member states to make well-informed

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007

decisions. Also requests that the Secretary-General take all necessary action to ensure that UNAMID is administered with a maximum of efficiency and economy.

Authorizes the Secretary-General to establish a special account for UNAMID for the purpose of accounting for the income received and expenditure incurred in respect of UNAMID. Decides to appropriate to the Special Account for UNAMID the amount of \$1,275,653,700 for the period from July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2008, for the establishment of UNAMID.

Also decides to apportion among member states the amount of \$1,275,653,700 for the period from July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2008, in accordance with the levels updated in General Assembly Resolution 61/243 of December 22, 2006, and taking into account the scale of assessments for 2007 and 2008, as set out in its Resolution 61/237 of December 22, 2006. Further decides that, in accordance with the provisions of its Resolution 973 (X) of December 15, 1955, there shall be set off against the apportionment among member states, their respective share in the Tax Equalization Fund of \$11,380,200, representing the estimated staff assessment income approved for UNAMID.

Background: UNAMID was established by Security Council Resolution 1769 on July 31, 2007, to support the implementation of the Darfur Peace Agreement, as well as to protect civilians. The adoption of Resolution 1769 followed the adoption in August 2006 of Security Council Resolution 1706, which first called for a UN force to deploy to Darfur. General Assembly Resolution 62/232 approved \$1.28 billion for the launch of UNAMID for the period from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008.

U.S. Position: The United States is committed to supporting this peacekeeping operation in Darfur. Approximately one quarter of UNAMID's budget is funded by the United States through assessed UN contributions. To help expedite UNAMID deployment, the United States is also providing, with international partners, training and equipment support to UNAMID troop contributing countries in Africa.

## 10. Reports of the Office of Internal Oversight Services and Financing of the Procurement Task Force

**A/Res/62/234**

December 22

Takes note of the reports on the activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) and the related notes by the Secretary-General, the report of the OIOS on the inspection of the program and administrative management of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia and the related note by the Secretary-General, the report of the OIOS on the audit of the activities of the United Nations Thessaloniki Centre for Public Service Professionalism, the report of the Secretary-General on the Procurement Task Force (PTF), and the report of the Secretary-General on the resource

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

requirements for procurement investigations. Regrets the piecemeal manner in which the investigations-related issues contained in these reports have been presented to the General Assembly for its consideration. Endorses the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ), subject to the provisions of the present resolution. Decides to conduct an overall review of the capacity of the Investigations Division of the OIOS (ID/OIOS) by June 30, 2008, and that the review will include, among other things, the activities of the PTF.

Notes the ad hoc nature of the PTF and, in accordance with Regulations 7.6 and 7.7 of the Financial Regulations and Rules of the UN, requests that the ACABQ request the Board of Auditors to conduct an audit of the activities of the Task Force for the period from January 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007 including its compliance with established transparency and accountability measures of the UN and the OIOS, and to report thereon separately to the General Assembly at the main part of its 63<sup>rd</sup> session.

Background: The investigation into corruption in the Oil-for-Food program by former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Paul Volcker paved the way for the establishment of the PTF by the OIOS in January 2006. The PTF was created to look into allegations of fraud and malfeasance in the UN's procurement service. At the time of the adoption of this resolution, the PTF had 287 open cases and had completed 63 separate investigations, uncovering 10 different schemes to defraud UN procurements. In other words, it had a significant amount of work and was showing success in identifying fraud within the procurement system.

Despite these successes, a few member states have been highly critical of the conduct of the PTF's investigations. During the negotiations on this resolution, G-77 members, in particular Singapore, called for limiting the PTF's mandate to run only through June 2008. The OIOS countered that the PTF would be unable to complete its open investigations by June 30, and that the PTF would have difficulty retaining investigators if funding for its activities were provided for only six months. The G-77 push was unsuccessful. After much deliberation, the resolution was adopted and the PTF mandate extended to December 31, 2008. Singapore spoke after the action to welcome its adoption by consensus.

U.S. Position: The United States values the OIOS for its role in promoting a culture of transparency, accountability, and integrity in the UN. member states need to be able to have confidence that all UN employees are functioning according to the highest ethical standards. We are committed to ensuring responsible management of UN resources in order to improve its efficiency and effectiveness in aiding the world's most vulnerable citizens.

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

This resolution, including the extended mandate for the PTF, was important to our efforts to achieve these goals.

11. Program Budget for the Biennium 2008-2009

**A/Res/62/237**

December 22

Resolves that, for the biennium 2008–2009, appropriations totaling \$4,171,359,700 are hereby approved; the Secretary-General shall be authorized to transfer credits between sections of the budget with the concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions; and, in addition to the approved appropriations, an amount of \$75,000 is appropriated for each year of the biennium 2008-2009 from the accumulated income of the Library Endowment Fund for the purchase of books, periodicals, maps, library equipment and for other expenses of the library at the Palais des Nations in Geneva.

Resolves that, for the biennium 2008-2009, estimates of income other than assessments on Member States totaling \$515,460,600 are approved.

Resolves that, for 2008, budget appropriations totaling \$2,085,679,850, being half of the appropriation approved for the biennium 2008-2009, plus \$19,876,500, being the increase in revised appropriations for the biennium 2006-2007 approved by the General Assembly in its Resolutions 61/258 of March 26, 2007, 61/275 of June 29, 2007, and 62/235 of December 22, 2007, shall be financed in accordance with Regulations 3.1 and 3.2 of the Financial Regulations and Rules of the United Nations.

*Background:* The General Assembly agreed to an initial budget of \$4.171 billion, slightly below the final budget for the previous biennium (\$4.193 billion). In approving the initial budget, the General Assembly deferred to a resumed session several activities that, if approved, could increase the budget substantially during the biennium. These include special political missions, construction costs, secretariat restructuring proposals, and various UN reform initiatives, among others. The UN Secretariat has indicated informally that the increases could amount to \$1 billion. Those estimates will be updated in the course of the biennium.

*U.S. Position:* The United States joined consensus on this resolution, but only after calling for a vote on the related resolution containing the detailed budget, “Questions Relating to the Proposed Program Budget for the Biennium 2008-2009.” We called for a vote on this resolution because of our concern over the “piecemeal” and “ad hoc” approach the Secretary-General had taken in constructing the budget. We were concerned that this approach could result in the final budget being significantly higher than the budget proposed in Resolution 62/237.

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

We were particularly concerned that this open-ended budgeting could allow the Durban Review Conference to be funded out of the UN regular budget. The United States believes this conference is likely to be fundamentally and fatally flawed by the same anti-Israel tone that marked the first World Conference on Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance, which took place in Durban, South Africa, in September 2001. The U.S. delegation was instructed to return home from that conference by Secretary of State Colin Powell due to the anti-Semitic tone and content of the proceedings.

#### COMPARISON WITH U.S. VOTES

The tables that follow summarize UN member state performance at the 62<sup>nd</sup> UNGA in comparison with the United States on the 13 important votes. In these tables, “Identical Votes” is the total number of times the United States and the listed state both voted Yes or No on these issues. “Opposite Votes” is the total number of times the United States voted Yes and the listed state No, or the United States voted No and the listed state Yes. “Abstentions” and “Absences” are totals for the country being compared on these 13 votes. “Voting Coincidence (Votes Only)” is calculated by dividing the number of identical votes by the total of identical and opposite votes. The column headed “Voting Coincidence (Including Consensus)” presents the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including the 11 important consensus resolutions as identical votes. The extent of participation was also factored in. (See the second paragraph in this section.)

The first table lists all UN member states in alphabetical order. The second lists them by number of identical votes in descending order; those states with the same number of identical votes are further ranked by the number of opposite votes in ascending order. Countries with the same number of both identical votes and opposite votes are listed alphabetically. Subsequent tables are comparisons of UN member states by regional and other groupings to which they belong, again ranked in descending order of identical votes.

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

**All Countries (Alphabetical)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Afghanistan	3	9	0	1	60.9%	25.0%
Albania	6	0	3	4	100%	100%
Algeria	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Andorra	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Angola	1	8	3	1	60.0%	11.1%
Antigua-Barbuda	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Argentina	6	6	1	0	73.9%	50.0%
Armenia	3	9	1	0	60.9%	25.0%
Australia	11	2	0	0	91.7%	84.6%
Austria	7	4	2	0	81.8%	63.6%
Azerbaijan	1	8	0	4	60.0%	11.1%
Bahamas	6	6	1	0	73.9%	50.0%
Bahrain	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Bangladesh	2	11	0	0	54.2%	15.4%
Barbados	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Belarus	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Belgium	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Belize	4	6	2	1	71.4%	40.0%
Benin	2	7	3	1	65.0%	22.2%
Bhutan	3	5	2	3	73.7%	37.5%
Bolivia	1	5	3	4	70.6%	16.7%
Bosnia/Herzegovina	7	3	1	2	85.7%	70.0%
Botswana	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Brazil	3	7	3	0	66.7%	30.0%
Brunei Darussalam	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Bulgaria	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Burkina Faso	1	7	3	2	63.2%	12.5%
Burundi	6	3	0	4	85.0%	66.7%
Cambodia	2	8	1	2	61.9%	20.0%
Cameroon	1	2	6	4	85.7%	33.3%
Canada	11	2	0	0	91.7%	84.6%
Cape Verde	2	5	3	3	72.2%	28.6%
Central African Rep.	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Chad	1	3	3	6	80.0%	25.0%
Chile	6	7	0	0	70.8%	46.2%
China	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Colombia	1	4	8	0	75.0%	20.0%
Comoros	0	7	2	4	61.1%	0.0%
Congo	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Costa Rica	6	6	1	0	73.9%	50.0%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Côte d'Ivoire	1	3	6	3	80.0%	25.0%
Croatia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Cuba	0	12	0	1	47.8%	0.0%
Cyprus	7	5	1	0	78.3%	58.3%
Czech Republic	6	3	3	1	85.0%	66.7%
DPR of Korea	0	12	0	1	47.8%	0.0%
Dem. Rep. Congo	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Denmark	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Djibouti	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Dominica	1	3	4	5	80.0%	25.0%
Dominican Republic	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Ecuador	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Egypt	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
El Salvador	6	5	1	1	77.3%	54.5%
Equatorial Guinea	4	1	1	7	93.8%	80.0%
Eritrea	2	8	3	0	61.9%	20.0%
Estonia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Ethiopia	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Fiji	4	4	2	3	78.9%	50.0%
Finland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
France	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Gabon	1	7	0	5	63.2%	12.5%
Gambia	0	5	0	8	68.8%	0.0%
Georgia	5	3	5	0	84.2%	62.5%
Germany	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Ghana	3	7	3	0	66.7%	30.0%
Greece	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Grenada	4	2	0	7	88.2%	66.7%
Guatemala	3	4	6	0	77.8%	42.9%
Guinea	1	10	2	0	54.5%	9.1%
Guinea-Bissau	1	1	0	11	92.3%	50.0%
Guyana	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Haiti	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Honduras	6	6	1	0	73.9%	50.0%
Hungary	7	3	1	2	85.7%	70.0%
Iceland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
India	1	11	1	0	52.2%	8.3%
Indonesia	0	11	2	0	50.0%	0.0%
Iran	0	12	0	1	47.8%	0.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

**All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Iraq	2	6	2	3	68.4%	25.0%
Ireland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Israel	11	0	0	2	100%	100%
Italy	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Jamaica	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Japan	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Jordan	1	7	3	2	63.2%	12.5%
Kazakhstan	3	9	1	0	60.9%	25.0%
Kenya	2	7	3	1	65.0%	22.2%
Kiribati	3	1	0	9	93.3%	75.0%
Kuwait	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Kyrgyzstan	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Laos	1	10	2	0	54.5%	9.1%
Latvia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Lebanon	2	10	1	0	56.5%	16.7%
Lesotho	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Liberia	5	4	0	4	80.0%	55.6%
Libya	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Liechtenstein	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Lithuania	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Luxembourg	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Madagascar	3	4	0	6	77.8%	42.9%
Malawi	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Malaysia	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Maldives	2	9	0	2	59.1%	18.2%
Mali	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Malta	7	5	1	0	78.3%	58.3%
Marshall Islands	11	0	1	1	100%	100%
Mauritania	3	8	1	1	63.6%	27.3%
Mauritius	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Mexico	5	5	3	0	76.2%	50.0%
Micronesia	10	1	1	1	95.5%	90.9%
Moldova	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Monaco	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Mongolia	3	4	3	3	77.8%	42.9%
Montenegro	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Morocco	2	9	2	0	59.1%	18.2%
Mozambique	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Namibia	1	7	4	1	63.2%	12.5%
Nauru	8	2	2	1	90.5%	80.0%
Nepal	1	6	5	1	66.7%	14.3%
Netherlands	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
New Zealand	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Nicaragua	1	10	2	0	54.5%	9.1%
Niger	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Nigeria	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Norway	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Oman	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Pakistan	1	11	1	0	52.2%	8.3%
Palau	11	0	1	1	100%	100%
Panama	5	5	3	0	76.2%	50.0%
Papua New Guinea	2	1	3	7	92.9%	66.7%
Paraguay	5	4	1	3	80.0%	55.6%
Peru	6	4	3	0	81.0%	60.0%
Philippines	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Poland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Portugal	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Qatar	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Republic of Korea	4	3	6	0	83.3%	57.1%
Romania	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Russia	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Rwanda	2	4	3	4	76.5%	33.3%
St. Kitts and Nevis	1	3	4	5	80.0%	25.0%
Saint Lucia	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	2	5	3	3	72.2%	28.6%
Samoa	4	2	4	3	88.2%	66.7%
San Marino	7	2	3	1	90.0%	77.8%
Sao Tome/Principe	1	1	3	8	92.3%	50.0%
Saudi Arabia	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Senegal	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Serbia	6	2	4	1	89.5%	75.0%
Seychelles	0	1	0	12	91.7%	0.0%
Sierra Leone	1	4	5	3	75.0%	20.0%
Singapore	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Slovak Republic	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Slovenia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Solomon Islands	1	4	5	3	75.0%	20.0%
Somalia	0	8	0	5	57.9%	0.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

**All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
South Africa	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Spain	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Sri Lanka	2	9	2	0	59.1%	18.2%
Sudan	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Suriname	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Swaziland	0	7	5	1	61.1%	0.0%
Sweden	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Switzerland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Syria	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Tajikistan	0	8	0	5	57.9%	0.0%
Thailand	1	5	7	0	70.6%	16.7%
TFYR Macedonia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Timor-Leste	6	3	0	4	85.0%	66.7%
Togo	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Tonga	6	2	3	2	89.5%	75.0%
Trinidad and Tobago	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Tunisia	0	9	1	3	55.0%	0.0%
Turkey	5	6	0	2	72.7%	45.5%
Turkmenistan	0	6	1	6	64.7%	0.0%
Tuvalu	2	3	1	7	81.3%	40.0%
Uganda	1	8	3	1	60.0%	11.1%
Ukraine	7	2	3	1	90.0%	77.8%
United Arab Emirates	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
United Kingdom	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
UR Tanzania	2	7	3	1	65.0%	22.2%
Uruguay	5	5	3	0	76.2%	50.0%
Uzbekistan	1	11	0	1	52.2%	8.3%
Vanuatu	5	2	3	3	88.9%	71.4%
Venezuela	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Vietnam	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Yemen	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Zambia	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Zimbabwe	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Average					70.9%	36.0%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Israel	11	0	0	2	100%	100%
Marshall Islands	11	0	1	1	100%	100%
Palau	11	0	1	1	100%	100%
Australia	11	2	0	0	91.7%	84.6%
Canada	11	2	0	0	91.7%	84.6%
Micronesia	10	1	1	1	95.5%	90.9%
Nauru	8	2	2	1	90.5%	80.0%
San Marino	7	2	3	1	90.0%	77.8%
Ukraine	7	2	3	1	90.0%	77.8%
Andorra	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Belgium	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Bosnia-Herzegovina	7	3	1	2	85.7%	70.0%
Bulgaria	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Croatia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Denmark	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Estonia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Finland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
France	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Germany	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Greece	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Hungary	7	3	1	2	85.7%	70.0%
Iceland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Ireland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Italy	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Japan	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Latvia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Liechtenstein	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Lithuania	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Luxembourg	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Monaco	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Montenegro	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Netherlands	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
New Zealand	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Poland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Portugal	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Romania	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Slovak Republic	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Slovenia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Spain	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

**All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Sweden	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Switzerland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
TFYR Macedonia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
United Kingdom	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Austria	7	4	2	0	81.8%	63.6%
Cyprus	7	5	1	0	78.3%	58.3%
Malta	7	5	1	0	78.3%	58.3%
Albania	6	0	3	4	100%	100%
Serbia	6	2	4	1	89.5%	75.0%
Tonga	6	2	3	2	89.5%	75.0%
Burundi	6	3	0	4	85.0%	66.7%
Czech Republic	6	3	3	1	85.0%	66.7%
Moldova	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Norway	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Timor Leste	6	3	0	4	85.0%	66.7%
Peru	6	4	3	0	81.0%	60.0%
El Salvador	6	5	1	1	77.3%	54.5%
Argentina	6	6	1	0	73.9%	50.0%
Bahamas	6	6	1	0	73.9%	50.0%
Costa Rica	6	6	1	0	73.9%	50.0%
Honduras	6	6	1	0	73.9%	50.0%
Chile	6	7	0	0	70.8%	46.2%
Vanuatu	5	2	3	3	88.9%	71.4%
Georgia	5	3	5	0	84.2%	62.5%
Liberia	5	4	0	4	80.0%	55.6%
Paraguay	5	4	1	3	80.0%	55.6%
Mexico	5	5	3	0	76.2%	50.0%
Panama	5	5	3	0	76.2%	50.0%
Uruguay	5	5	3	0	76.2%	50.0%
Turkey	5	6	0	2	72.7%	45.5%
Equatorial Guinea	4	1	1	7	93.8%	80.0%
Grenada	4	2	0	7	88.2%	66.7%
Samoa	4	2	4	3	88.2%	66.7%
Republic of Korea	4	3	6	0	83.3%	57.1%
Fiji	4	4	2	3	78.9%	50.0%
Belize	4	6	2	1	71.4%	40.0%
Kiribati	3	1	0	9	93.3%	75.0%
Guatemala	3	4	6	0	77.8%	42.9%
Madagascar	3	4	0	6	77.8%	42.9%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Mongolia	3	4	3	3	77.8%	42.9%
Bhutan	3	5	2	3	73.7%	37.5%
Brazil	3	7	3	0	66.7%	30.0%
Ghana	3	7	3	0	66.7%	30.0%
Mauritania	3	8	1	1	63.6%	27.3%
Afghanistan	3	9	0	1	60.9%	25.0%
Armenia	3	9	1	0	60.9%	25.0%
Kazakhstan	3	9	1	0	60.9%	25.0%
Papua New Guinea	2	1	3	7	92.9%	66.7%
Tuvalu	2	3	1	7	81.3%	40.0%
Rwanda	2	4	3	4	76.5%	33.3%
Cape Verde	2	5	3	3	72.2%	28.6%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	2	5	3	3	72.2%	28.6%
Iraq	2	6	2	3	68.4%	25.0%
Benin	2	7	3	1	65.0%	22.2%
Ecuador	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Guyana	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Haiti	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Kenya	2	7	3	1	65.0%	22.2%
Malawi	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Mauritius	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Nigeria	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Saint Lucia	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
U.R. Tanzania	2	7	3	1	65.0%	22.2%
Cambodia	2	8	1	2	61.9%	20.0%
Eritrea	2	8	3	0	61.9%	20.0%
Maldives	2	9	0	2	59.1%	18.2%
Morocco	2	9	2	0	59.1%	18.2%
Sri Lanka	2	9	2	0	59.1%	18.2%
Lebanon	2	10	1	0	56.5%	16.7%
Bangladesh	2	11	0	0	54.2%	15.4%
Guinea-Bissau	1	1	0	11	92.3%	50.0%
Sao Tome\Principe	1	1	3	8	92.3%	50.0%
Cameroon	1	2	6	4	85.7%	33.3%
Chad	1	3	3	6	80.0%	25.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	1	3	6	3	80.0%	25.0%
Dominica	1	3	4	5	80.0%	25.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

**All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING INCLUDING CONSENSUS	COINCIDENCE VOTES ONLY
St. Kitts and Nevis	1	3	4	5	80.0%	25.0%
Colombia	1	4	8	0	75.0%	20.0%
Sierra Leone	1	4	5	3	75.0%	20.0%
Solomon Islands	1	4	5	3	75.0%	20.0%
Bolivia	1	5	3	4	70.6%	16.7%
Thailand	1	5	7	0	70.6%	16.7%
Central African Rep.	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Dem. Rep. Of Congo	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Ethiopia	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Nepal	1	6	5	1	66.7%	14.3%
Suriname	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Botswana	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Burkina Faso	1	7	3	2	63.2%	12.5%
Gabon	1	7	0	5	63.2%	12.5%
Jamaica	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Jordan	1	7	3	2	63.2%	12.5%
Lesotho	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Mozambique	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Namibia	1	7	4	1	63.2%	12.5%
Philippines	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Trinidad/Tobago	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Angola	1	8	3	1	60.0%	11.1%
Antigua-Barbuda	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Azerbaijan	1	8	0	4	60.0%	11.1%
Barbados	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Congo	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Dominican Republic	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Russia	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Singapore	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Uganda	1	8	3	1	60.0%	11.1%
Bahrain	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Niger	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Saudi Arabia	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Senegal	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Togo	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Guinea	1	10	2	0	54.5%	9.1%
Laos	1	10	2	0	54.5%	9.1%
Nicaragua	1	10	2	0	54.5%	9.1%
India	1	11	1	0	52.2%	8.3%
Pakistan	1	11	1	0	52.2%	8.3%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Uzbekistan	1	11	0	1	52.2%	8.3%
Belarus	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
China	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Venezuela	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Vietnam	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Seychelles	0	1	0	12	91.7%	0.0%
Gambia	0	5	0	8	68.8%	0.0%
Turkmenistan	0	6	1	6	64.7%	0.0%
Comoros	0	7	2	4	61.1%	0.0%
Swaziland	0	7	5	1	61.1%	0.0%
Brunei Darussalam	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Mali	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Somalia	0	8	0	5	57.9%	0.0%
Tajikistan	0	8	0	5	57.9%	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Zambia	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Djibouti	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
South Africa	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Tunisia	0	9	1	3	55.0%	0.0%
Yemen	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Kuwait	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Kyrgyzstan	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Qatar	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Indonesia	0	11	2	0	50.0%	0.0%
Algeria	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Cuba	0	12	0	1	47.8%	0.0%
DPR of Korea	0	12	0	1	47.8%	0.0%
Egypt	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Iran	0	12	0	1	47.8%	0.0%
Libya	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Malaysia	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Oman	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Sudan	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Syria	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Zimbabwe	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Average					70.9%	36.0%

## UN REGIONAL GROUPS

The following tables show the voting coincidence percentage with U.S. votes on the 13 important votes.

### African Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Burundi	6	3	0	4	85.0%	66.7%
Liberia	5	4	0	4	80.0%	55.6%
Equatorial Guinea	4	1	1	7	93.8%	80.0%
Madagascar	3	4	0	6	77.8%	42.9%
Ghana	3	7	3	0	66.7%	30.0%
Mauritania	3	8	1	1	63.6%	27.3%
Rwanda	2	4	3	4	76.5%	33.3%
Cape Verde	2	5	3	3	72.2%	28.6%
Benin	2	7	3	1	65.0%	22.2%
Kenya	2	7	3	1	65.0%	22.2%
Malawi	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Mauritius	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Nigeria	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
U.R. Tanzania	2	7	3	1	65.0%	22.2%
Eritrea	2	8	3	0	61.9%	20.0%
Morocco	2	9	2	0	59.1%	18.2%
Guinea-Bissau	1	1	0	11	92.3%	50.0%
Sao Tome\Principe	1	1	3	8	92.3%	50.0%
Cameroon	1	2	6	4	85.7%	33.3%
Chad	1	3	3	6	80.0%	25.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	1	3	6	3	80.0%	25.0%
Sierra Leone	1	4	5	3	75.0%	20.0%
Central African Rep.	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Dem. Rep. Of Congo	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Ethiopia	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Botswana	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Burkina Faso	1	7	3	2	63.2%	12.5%
Gabon	1	7	0	5	63.2%	12.5%
Lesotho	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Mozambique	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Namibia	1	7	4	1	63.2%	12.5%
Angola	1	8	3	1	60.0%	11.1%
Congo	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Uganda	1	8	3	1	60.0%	11.1%
Niger	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Senegal	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**African Group (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Togo	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Guinea	1	10	2	0	54.5%	9.1%
Seychelles	0	1	0	12	91.7%	0.0%
Gambia	0	5	0	8	68.8%	0.0%
Comoros	0	7	2	4	61.1%	0.0%
Swaziland	0	7	5	1	61.1%	0.0%
Mali	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Somalia	0	8	0	5	57.9%	0.0%
Zambia	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Djibouti	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
South Africa	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Tunisia	0	9	1	3	55.0%	0.0%
Algeria	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Egypt	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Libya	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Sudan	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Zimbabwe	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Average					64.3%	15.5%

**Asian Group**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Marshall Islands	11	0	1	1	100%	100%
Palau	11	0	1	1	100%	100%
Micronesia	10	1	1	1	95.5%	90.9%
Nauru	8	2	2	1	90.5%	80.0%
Japan	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Cyprus	7	5	1	0	78.3%	58.3%
Tonga	6	2	3	2	89.5%	75.0%
Timor Leste	6	3	0	4	85.0%	66.7%
Vanuatu	5	2	3	3	88.9%	71.4%
Samoa	4	2	4	3	88.2%	66.7%
Republic of Korea	4	3	6	0	83.3%	57.1%
Fiji	4	4	2	3	78.9%	50.0%
Mongolia	3	4	3	3	77.8%	42.9%
Bhutan	3	5	2	3	73.7%	37.5%
Afghanistan	3	9	0	1	60.9%	25.0%
Kazakhstan	3	9	1	0	60.9%	25.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

**Asian Group (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Papua New Guinea	2	1	3	7	92.9%	66.7%
Tuvalu	2	3	1	7	81.3%	40.0%
Iraq	2	6	2	3	68.4%	25.0%
Cambodia	2	8	1	2	61.9%	20.0%
Maldives	2	9	0	2	59.1%	18.2%
Sri Lanka	2	9	2	0	59.1%	18.2%
Lebanon	2	10	1	0	56.5%	16.7%
Bangladesh	2	11	0	0	54.2%	15.4%
Solomon Islands	1	4	5	3	75.0%	20.0%
Thailand	1	5	7	0	70.6%	16.7%
Nepal	1	6	5	1	66.7%	14.3%
Jordan	1	7	3	2	63.2%	12.5%
Philippines	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Singapore	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Bahrain	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Saudi Arabia	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Laos	1	10	2	0	54.5%	9.1%
India	1	11	1	0	52.2%	8.3%
Pakistan	1	11	1	0	52.2%	8.3%
Uzbekistan	1	11	0	1	52.2%	8.3%
China	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Vietnam	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Turkmenistan	0	6	1	6	64.7%	0.0%
Brunei Darussalam	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Tajikistan	0	8	0	5	57.9%	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Yemen	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Kuwait	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Kyrgyzstan	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Qatar	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Indonesia	0	11	2	0	50.0%	0.0%
DPR of Korea	0	12	0	1	47.8%	0.0%
Iran	0	12	0	1	47.8%	0.0%
Malaysia	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Oman	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Syria	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Average					64.8%	24.7%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**Latin American and Caribbean Group (LAC)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING INCLUDING CONSENSUS	COINCIDENCE VOTES ONLY
Peru	6	4	3	0	81.0%	60.0%
El Salvador	6	5	1	1	77.3%	54.5%
Argentina	6	6	1	0	73.9%	50.0%
Bahamas	6	6	1	0	73.9%	50.0%
Costa Rica	6	6	1	0	73.9%	50.0%
Honduras	6	6	1	0	73.9%	50.0%
Chile	6	7	0	0	70.8%	46.2%
Paraguay	5	4	1	3	80.0%	55.6%
Mexico	5	5	3	0	76.2%	50.0%
Panama	5	5	3	0	76.2%	50.0%
Uruguay	5	5	3	0	76.2%	50.0%
Grenada	4	2	0	7	88.2%	66.7%
Belize	4	6	2	1	71.4%	40.0%
Guatemala	3	4	6	0	77.8%	42.9%
Brazil	3	7	3	0	66.7%	30.0%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	2	5	3	3	72.2%	28.6%
Ecuador	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Guyana	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Haiti	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Saint Lucia	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Dominica	1	3	4	5	80.0%	25.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	1	3	4	5	80.0%	25.0%
Colombia	1	4	8	0	75.0%	20.0%
Bolivia	1	5	3	4	70.6%	16.7%
Suriname	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Jamaica	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Trinidad/Tobago	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Antigua-Barbuda	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Barbados	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Dominican Republic	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Nicaragua	1	10	2	0	54.5%	9.1%
Venezuela	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Cuba	0	12	0	1	47.8%	0.0%
Average					69.3%	32.5%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

**Western European and Others Group (WEOG)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Israel	11	0	0	2	100%	100%
Australia	11	2	0	0	91.7%	84.6%
Canada	11	2	0	0	91.7%	84.6%
San Marino	7	2	3	1	90.0%	77.8%
Andorra	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Belgium	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Denmark	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Finland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
France	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Germany	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Greece	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Iceland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Ireland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Italy	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Liechtenstein	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Luxembourg	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Monaco	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Netherlands	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
New Zealand	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Portugal	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Spain	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Sweden	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Switzerland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
United Kingdom	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Austria	7	4	2	0	81.8%	63.6%
Malta	7	5	1	0	78.3%	58.3%
Norway	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Turkey	5	6	0	2	72.7%	45.5%
Average					85.9%	70.9%

**Eastern European Group (EE)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Ukraine	7	2	3	1	90.0%	77.8%
Bosnia-Herzegovina	7	3	1	2	85.7%	70.0%
Bulgaria	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Croatia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**Eastern European Group (EE) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Estonia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Hungary	7	3	1	2	85.7%	70.0%
Latvia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Lithuania	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Montenegro	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Poland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Romania	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Slovak Republic	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Slovenia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
TFYR Macedonia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Albania	6	0	3	4	100%	100%
Serbia	6	2	4	1	89.5%	75.0%
Czech Republic	6	3	3	1	85.0%	66.7%
Moldova	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Georgia	5	3	5	0	84.2%	62.5%
Armenia	3	9	1	0	60.9%	25.0%
Azerbaijan	1	8	0	4	60.0%	11.1%
Russia	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Belarus	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Average					81.3%	59.9%

## OTHER GROUPINGS

The following tables show percentage of voting coincidence with the U.S. for major groups on the 13 important votes, in rank order by identical votes.

### Arab Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Mauritania	3	8	1	1	63.6%	27.3%
Iraq	2	6	2	3	68.4%	25.0%
Morocco	2	9	2	0	59.1%	18.2%
Lebanon	2	10	1	0	56.5%	16.7%
Bangladesh	2	11	0	0	54.2%	15.4%
Jordan	1	7	3	2	63.2%	12.5%
Bahrain	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Saudi Arabia	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Somalia	0	8	0	5	57.9%	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Djibouti	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Tunisia	0	9	1	3	55.0%	0.0%
Kuwait	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Qatar	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Algeria	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Egypt	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Libya	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Oman	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Sudan	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Syria	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Average					54.5%	6.7%

### Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Cambodia	2	8	1	2	61.9%	20.0%
Thailand	1	5	7	0	70.6%	16.7%
Philippines	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Singapore	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Laos	1	10	2	0	54.5%	9.1%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Vietnam	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Brunei Darussalam	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Indonesia	0	11	2	0	50.0%	0.0%
Malaysia	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Average					55.9%	7.9%

**European Union (EU)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Belgium	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Bulgaria	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Denmark	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Estonia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Finland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
France	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Germany	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Greece	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Hungary	7	3	1	2	85.7%	70.0%
Ireland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Italy	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Latvia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Lithuania	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Luxembourg	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Netherlands	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Poland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Portugal	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Romania	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Slovak Republic	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Slovenia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Spain	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Sweden	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
United Kingdom	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Austria	7	4	2	0	81.8%	63.6%
Cyprus	7	5	1	0	78.3%	58.3%
Malta	7	5	1	0	78.3%	58.3%
Czech Republic	6	3	3	1	85.0%	66.7%
Average					84.9%	68.6%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

**Islamic Conference (OIC)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING INCLUDING CONSENSUS	COINCIDENCE VOTES ONLY
Albania	6	0	3	4	100%	100%
Turkey	5	6	0	2	72.7%	45.5%
Mauritania	3	8	1	1	63.6%	27.3%
Afghanistan	3	9	0	1	60.9%	25.0%
Kazakhstan	3	9	1	0	60.9%	25.0%
Iraq	2	6	2	3	68.4%	25.0%
Benin	2	7	3	1	65.0%	22.2%
Guyana	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Nigeria	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Maldives	2	9	0	2	59.1%	18.2%
Morocco	2	9	2	0	59.1%	18.2%
Lebanon	2	10	1	0	56.5%	16.7%
Bangladesh	2	11	0	0	54.2%	15.4%
Guinea-Bissau	1	1	0	11	92.3%	50.0%
Cameroon	1	2	6	4	85.7%	33.3%
Chad	1	3	3	6	80.0%	25.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	1	3	6	3	80.0%	25.0%
Sierra Leone	1	4	5	3	75.0%	20.0%
Suriname	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Burkina Faso	1	7	3	2	63.2%	12.5%
Gabon	1	7	0	5	63.2%	12.5%
Jordan	1	7	3	2	63.2%	12.5%
Mozambique	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Azerbaijan	1	8	0	4	60.0%	11.1%
Uganda	1	8	3	1	60.0%	11.1%
Bahrain	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Niger	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Saudi Arabia	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Senegal	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Togo	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Guinea	1	10	2	0	54.5%	9.1%
Pakistan	1	11	1	0	52.2%	8.3%
Uzbekistan	1	11	0	1	52.2%	8.3%
Gambia	0	5	0	8	68.8%	0.0%
Turkmenistan	0	6	1	6	64.7%	0.0%
Comoros	0	7	2	4	61.1%	0.0%
Brunei Darussalam	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Mali	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Somalia	0	8	0	5	57.9%	0.0%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**Islamic Conference (OIC) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Tajikistan	0	8	0	5	57.9%	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Djibouti	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Tunisia	0	9	1	3	55.0%	0.0%
Yemen	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Kuwait	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Kyrgyzstan	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Qatar	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Indonesia	0	11	2	0	50.0%	0.0%
Algeria	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Egypt	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Iran	0	12	0	1	47.8%	0.0%
Libya	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Malaysia	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Oman	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Sudan	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Syria	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Average					59.4%	10.9%

**Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Burundi	6	3	0	4	85.0%	66.7%
Timor Leste	6	3	0	4	85.0%	66.7%
Peru	6	4	3	0	81.0%	60.0%
Bahamas	6	6	1	0	73.9%	50.0%
Honduras	6	6	1	0	73.9%	50.0%
Chile	6	7	0	0	70.8%	46.2%
Vanuatu	5	2	3	3	88.9%	71.4%
Liberia	5	4	0	4	80.0%	55.6%
Panama	5	5	3	0	76.2%	50.0%
Equatorial Guinea	4	1	1	7	93.8%	80.0%
Grenada	4	2	0	7	88.2%	66.7%
Belize	4	6	2	1	71.4%	40.0%
Guatemala	3	4	6	0	77.8%	42.9%
Madagascar	3	4	0	6	77.8%	42.9%
Mongolia	3	4	3	3	77.8%	42.9%
Bhutan	3	5	2	3	73.7%	37.5%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

**Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING INCLUDING CONSENSUS	COINCIDENCE VOTES ONLY
Ghana	3	7	3	0	66.7%	30.0%
Mauritania	3	8	1	1	63.6%	27.3%
Afghanistan	3	9	0	1	60.9%	25.0%
Papua New Guinea	2	1	3	7	92.9%	66.7%
Rwanda	2	4	3	4	76.5%	33.3%
Cape Verde	2	5	3	3	72.2%	28.6%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	2	5	3	3	72.2%	28.6%
Iraq	2	6	2	3	68.4%	25.0%
Benin	2	7	3	1	65.0%	22.2%
Ecuador	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Guyana	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Haiti	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Kenya	2	7	3	1	65.0%	22.2%
Malawi	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Mauritius	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Nigeria	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
Saint Lucia	2	7	4	0	65.0%	22.2%
U.R. Tanzania	2	7	3	1	65.0%	22.2%
Cambodia	2	8	1	2	61.9%	20.0%
Eritrea	2	8	3	0	61.9%	20.0%
Maldives	2	9	0	2	59.1%	18.2%
Morocco	2	9	2	0	59.1%	18.2%
Sri Lanka	2	9	2	0	59.1%	18.2%
Lebanon	2	10	1	0	56.5%	16.7%
Bangladesh	2	11	0	0	54.2%	15.4%
Guinea-Bissau	1	1	0	11	92.3%	50.0%
Sao Tome/Principe	1	1	3	8	92.3%	50.0%
Cameroon	1	2	6	4	85.7%	33.3%
Chad	1	3	3	6	80.0%	25.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	1	3	6	3	80.0%	25.0%
Dominica	1	3	4	5	80.0%	25.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	1	3	4	5	80.0%	25.0%
Colombia	1	4	8	0	75.0%	20.0%
Sierra Leone	1	4	5	3	75.0%	20.0%
Bolivia	1	5	3	4	70.6%	16.7%
Thailand	1	5	7	0	70.6%	16.7%
Central African Rep	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Dem. Rep. Of Congo	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Ethiopia	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Nepal	1	6	5	1	66.7%	14.3%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING INCLUDING CONSENSUS	COINCIDENCE VOTES ONLY
Suriname	1	6	3	3	66.7%	14.3%
Botswana	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Burkina Faso	1	7	3	2	63.2%	12.5%
Gabon	1	7	0	5	63.2%	12.5%
Jamaica	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Jordan	1	7	3	2	63.2%	12.5%
Lesotho	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Mozambique	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Namibia	1	7	4	1	63.2%	12.5%
Philippines	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Trinidad/Tobago	1	7	5	0	63.2%	12.5%
Angola	1	8	3	1	60.0%	11.1%
Antigua-Barbuda	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Barbados	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Congo	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Dominican Republic	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Singapore	1	8	4	0	60.0%	11.1%
Uganda	1	8	3	1	60.0%	11.1%
Bahrain	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Niger	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Saudi Arabia	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Senegal	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Togo	1	9	3	0	57.1%	10.0%
Guinea	1	10	2	0	54.5%	9.1%
Laos	1	10	2	0	54.5%	9.1%
Nicaragua	1	10	2	0	54.5%	9.1%
India	1	11	1	0	52.2%	8.3%
Pakistan	1	11	1	0	52.2%	8.3%
Uzbekistan	1	11	0	1	52.2%	8.3%
Belarus	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Venezuela	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Vietnam	1	12	0	0	50.0%	7.7%
Seychelles	0	1	0	12	91.7%	0.0%
Gambia	0	5	0	8	68.8%	0.0%
Turkmenistan	0	6	1	6	64.7%	0.0%
Comoros	0	7	2	4	61.1%	0.0%
Swaziland	0	7	5	1	61.1%	0.0%
Brunei Darussalam	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

**Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Mali	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Somalia	0	8	0	5	57.9%	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Zambia	0	8	5	0	57.9%	0.0%
Djibouti	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
South Africa	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Tunisia	0	9	1	3	55.0%	0.0%
Yemen	0	9	4	0	55.0%	0.0%
Kuwait	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Qatar	0	10	3	0	52.4%	0.0%
Indonesia	0	11	2	0	50.0%	0.0%
Algeria	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Cuba	0	12	0	1	47.8%	0.0%
DPR of Korea	0	12	0	1	47.8%	0.0%
Egypt	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Iran	0	12	0	1	47.8%	0.0%
Libya	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Malaysia	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Oman	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Sudan	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Syria	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Zimbabwe	0	12	1	0	47.8%	0.0%
Average					63.1%	17.1%

**Nordic Group**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Denmark	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Finland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Iceland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Sweden	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Norway	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Average					85.6%	69.4%

**North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Canada	11	2	0	0	91.7%	84.6%
Belgium	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Bulgaria	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Denmark	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Estonia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
France	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Germany	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Greece	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Hungary	7	3	1	2	85.7%	70.0%
Iceland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Italy	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Latvia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Lithuania	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Luxembourg	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Netherlands	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Poland	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Portugal	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Romania	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Slovak Republic	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Slovenia	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Spain	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
United Kingdom	7	3	3	0	85.7%	70.0%
Czech Republic	6	3	3	1	85.0%	66.7%
Norway	6	3	4	0	85.0%	66.7%
Turkey	5	6	0	2	72.7%	45.5%
Average					86.2%	70.5%

**COMPARISON OF IMPORTANT AND OVERALL VOTES**

The following table shows the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States in 2007 for both important votes and all Plenary votes, in a side-by-side comparison.

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Afghanistan	3	9	25.0%	9	70	11.4%
Albania	6	0	100%	22	31	41.5%
Algeria	0	12	0.0%	5	76	6.2%
Andorra	7	3	70.0%	26	41	38.8%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Angola	1	8	11.1%	5	40	11.1%
Antigua-Barbuda	1	8	11.1%	7	70	9.1%
Argentina	6	6	50.0%	12	64	15.8%
Armenia	3	9	25.0%	9	59	13.2%
Australia	11	2	84.6%	36	29	55.4%
Austria	7	4	63.6%	25	45	35.7%
Azerbaijan	1	8	11.1%	4	60	6.3%
Bahamas	6	6	50.0%	12	68	15.0%
Bahrain	1	9	10.0%	7	71	9.0%
Bangladesh	2	11	15.4%	8	74	9.8%
Barbados	1	8	11.1%	7	70	9.1%
Belarus	1	12	7.7%	5	71	6.6%
Belgium	7	3	70.0%	27	41	39.7%
Belize	4	6	40.0%	9	66	12.0%
Benin	2	7	22.2%	4	71	5.3%
Bhutan	3	5	37.5%	5	54	8.5%
Bolivia	1	5	16.7%	4	55	6.8%
Bosnia-Herzegovina	7	3	70.0%	25	38	39.7%
Botswana	1	7	12.5%	6	68	8.1%
Brazil	3	7	30.0%	8	67	10.7%
Brunei Darussalam	0	8	0.0%	5	68	6.8%
Bulgaria	7	3	70.0%	26	42	38.2%
Burkina Faso	1	7	12.5%	6	67	8.2%
Burundi	6	3	66.7%	10	54	15.6%
Cambodia	2	8	20.0%	7	71	9.0%
Cameroon	1	2	33.3%	4	45	8.2%
Canada	11	2	84.6%	35	29	54.7%
Cape Verde	2	5	28.6%	5	61	7.6%
Central African Rep	1	6	14.3%	4	61	6.2%
Chad	1	3	25.0%	4	19	17.4%
Chile	6	7	46.2%	12	65	15.6%
China	1	12	7.7%	7	68	9.3%
Colombia	1	4	20.0%	5	63	7.4%
Comoros	0	7	0.0%	4	63	6.0%
Congo	1	8	11.1%	6	69	8.0%
Costa Rica	6	6	50.0%	12	68	15.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	1	3	25.0%	4	46	8.0%
Croatia	7	3	70.0%	26	40	39.4%
Cuba	0	12	0.0%	2	74	2.6%
Cyprus	7	5	58.3%	26	46	36.1%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Czech Republic	6	3	66.7%	28	40	41.2%
DPR of Korea	0	12	0.0%	6	66	8.3%
Dem. Rep. Of Congo	1	6	14.3%	3	35	7.9%
Denmark	7	3	70.0%	28	41	40.6%
Djibouti	0	9	0.0%	5	72	6.5%
Dominica	1	3	25.0%	5	34	12.8%
Dominican Republic	1	8	11.1%	6	72	7.7%
Ecuador	2	7	22.2%	7	69	9.2%
Egypt	0	12	0.0%	5	74	6.3%
El Salvador	6	5	54.5%	10	67	13.0%
Equatorial Guinea	4	1	80.0%	7	28	20.0%
Eritrea	2	8	20.0%	7	71	9.0%
Estonia	7	3	70.0%	26	40	39.4%
Ethiopia	1	6	14.3%	5	59	7.8%
Fiji	4	4	50.0%	9	54	14.3%
Finland	7	3	70.0%	26	42	38.2%
France	7	3	70.0%	32	33	49.2%
Gabon	1	7	12.5%	4	67	5.6%
Gambia	0	5	0.0%	2	52	3.7%
Georgia	5	3	62.5%	24	42	36.4%
Germany	7	3	70.0%	27	43	38.6%
Ghana	3	7	30.0%	8	68	10.5%
Greece	7	3	70.0%	27	39	40.9%
Grenada	4	2	66.7%	8	45	15.1%
Guatemala	3	4	42.9%	9	65	12.2%
Guinea	1	10	9.1%	6	73	7.6%
Guinea-Bissau	1	1	50.0%	2	31	6.1%
Guyana	2	7	22.2%	8	69	10.4%
Haiti	2	7	22.2%	7	70	9.1%
Honduras	6	6	50.0%	11	68	13.9%
Hungary	7	3	70.0%	27	37	42.2%
Iceland	7	3	70.0%	27	43	38.6%
India	1	11	8.3%	11	64	14.7%
Indonesia	0	11	0.0%	6	74	7.5%
Iran	0	12	0.0%	3	71	4.1%
Iraq	2	6	25.0%	7	68	9.3%
Ireland	7	3	70.0%	25	44	36.2%
Israel	11	0	100%	51	8	86.4%
Italy	7	3	70.0%	27	42	39.1%
Jamaica	1	7	12.5%	7	69	9.2%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Japan	7	3	70.0%	25	42	37.3%
Jordan	1	7	12.5%	7	69	9.2%
Kazakhstan	3	9	25.0%	8	67	10.7%
Kenya	2	7	22.2%	7	63	10.0%
Kiribati	3	1	75.0%	4	2	66.7%
Kuwait	0	10	0.0%	6	73	7.6%
Kyrgyzstan	0	10	0.0%	5	67	6.9%
Laos	1	10	9.1%	5	71	6.6%
Latvia	7	3	70.0%	27	39	40.9%
Lebanon	2	10	16.7%	7	72	8.9%
Lesotho	1	7	12.5%	6	68	8.1%
Liberia	5	4	55.6%	9	51	15.0%
Libya	0	12	0.0%	5	74	6.3%
Liechtenstein	7	3	70.0%	23	43	34.8%
Lithuania	7	3	70.0%	27	41	39.7%
Luxembourg	7	3	70.0%	27	41	39.7%
Madagascar	3	4	42.9%	6	52	10.3%
Malawi	2	7	22.2%	7	65	9.7%
Malaysia	0	12	0.0%	5	73	6.4%
Maldives	2	9	18.2%	8	68	10.5%
Mali	0	8	0.0%	4	72	5.3%
Malta	7	5	58.3%	25	45	35.7%
Marshall Islands	11	0	100%	45	19	70.3%
Mauritania	3	8	27.3%	9	70	11.4%
Mauritius	2	7	22.2%	6	65	8.5%
Mexico	5	5	50.0%	12	64	15.8%
Micronesia	10	1	90.9%	39	21	65.0%
Moldova	6	3	66.7%	25	40	38.5%
Monaco	7	3	70.0%	26	35	42.6%
Mongolia	3	4	42.9%	9	64	12.3%
Montenegro	7	3	70.0%	26	41	38.8%
Morocco	2	9	18.2%	7	72	8.9%
Mozambique	1	7	12.5%	6	70	7.9%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	12	7.7%	6	74	7.5%
Namibia	1	7	12.5%	5	64	7.2%
Nauru	8	2	80.0%	18	30	37.5%
Nepal	1	6	14.3%	6	68	8.1%
Netherlands	7	3	70.0%	29	41	41.4%
New Zealand	7	3	70.0%	22	47	31.9%
Nicaragua	1	10	9.1%	6	73	7.6%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Niger	1	9	10.0%	6	71	7.8%
Nigeria	2	7	22.2%	8	68	10.5%
Norway	6	3	66.7%	25	42	37.3%
Oman	0	12	0.0%	6	74	7.5%
Pakistan	1	11	8.3%	8	65	11.0%
Palau	11	0	100%	44	13	77.2%
Panama	5	5	50.0%	11	66	14.3%
Papua New Guinea	2	1	66.7%	6	38	13.6%
Paraguay	5	4	55.6%	9	57	13.6%
Peru	6	4	60.0%	12	62	16.2%
Philippines	1	7	12.5%	6	70	7.9%
Poland	7	3	70.0%	27	38	41.5%
Portugal	7	3	70.0%	27	41	39.7%
Qatar	0	10	0.0%	6	72	7.7%
Republic of Korea	4	3	57.1%	19	39	32.8%
Romania	7	3	70.0%	26	40	39.4%
Russia	1	8	11.1%	8	59	11.9%
Rwanda	2	4	33.3%	7	47	13.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	1	3	25.0%	5	53	8.6%
Saint Lucia	2	7	22.2%	8	69	10.4%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	2	5	28.6%	6	55	9.8%
Samoa	4	2	66.7%	8	49	14.0%
San Marino	7	2	77.8%	25	42	37.3%
Sao Tome and Principe	1	1	50.0%	4	42	8.7%
Saudi Arabia	1	9	10.0%	7	71	9.0%
Senegal	1	9	10.0%	6	72	7.7%
Serbia	6	2	75.0%	24	40	37.5%
Seychelles	0	1	0.0%	0	1	0.0%
Sierra Leone	1	4	20.0%	5	57	8.1%
Singapore	1	8	11.1%	6	65	8.5%
Slovak Republic	7	3	70.0%	27	40	40.3%
Slovenia	7	3	70.0%	27	40	40.3%
Solomon Islands	1	4	20.0%	5	58	7.9%
Somalia	0	8	0.0%	4	57	6.6%
South Africa	0	9	0.0%	4	72	5.3%
Spain	7	3	70.0%	27	42	39.1%
Sri Lanka	2	9	18.2%	7	73	8.8%
Sudan	0	12	0.0%	4	73	5.2%
Suriname	1	6	14.3%	5	61	7.6%
Swaziland	0	7	0.0%	3	66	4.3%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2007*

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Sweden	7	3	70.0%	25	44	36.2%
Switzerland	7	3	70.0%	23	43	34.8%
Syria	0	12	0.0%	3	73	3.9%
Tajikistan	0	8	0.0%	2	59	3.3%
Thailand	1	5	16.7%	7	66	9.6%
TFYR Macedonia	7	3	70.0%	26	40	39.4%
Timor Leste	6	3	66.7%	10	35	22.2%
Togo	1	9	10.0%	6	70	7.9%
Tonga	6	2	75.0%	10	39	20.4%
Trinidad/Tobago	1	7	12.5%	6	68	8.1%
Tunisia	0	9	0.0%	4	71	5.3%
Turkey	5	6	45.5%	21	47	30.9%
Turkmenistan	0	6	0.0%	3	50	5.7%
Tuvalu	2	3	40.0%	4	23	14.8%
Uganda	1	8	11.1%	6	41	12.8%
Ukraine	7	2	77.8%	25	39	39.1%
United Arab Emirates	0	8	0.0%	5	69	6.8%
United Kingdom	7	3	70.0%	35	34	50.7%
U.R. Tanzania	2	7	22.2%	7	69	9.2%
Uruguay	5	5	50.0%	10	67	13.0%
Uzbekistan	1	11	8.3%	4	55	6.8%
Vanuatu	5	2	71.4%	8	20	28.6%
Venezuela	1	12	7.7%	5	75	6.3%
Vietnam	1	12	7.7%	4	74	5.1%
Yemen	0	9	0.0%	6	71	7.8%
Zambia	0	8	0.0%	4	70	5.4%
Zimbabwe	0	12	0.0%	5	75	6.3%